

*Rutgers University Studies
in Classical Humanities*

Volume IX

DEMETRIUS
of
PHALERUM

Text, Translation and Discussion

Edited by

William W. Fortenbaugh
Eckart Schütrumpf

DEMETRIUS

of

PHALERUM
Text, Translation and Discussion

Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities

Series Editor: William W. Fortenbaugh

Advisory Board: Dimitri Gutas
Pamela M. Huby
Eckart Schütrumpf
Robert W. Sharples

On Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics: The Work of Arius Didymus,
volume I

Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Work, volume II

*Theophrastean Studies: On Natural Science, Physics and Metaphysics,
Ethics, Religion and Rhetoric,* volume III

Cicero's Knowledge of the Peripatos, volume IV

*Theophrastus: His Psychological, Doxographical, and Scientific
Writings,* volume V

Peripatetic Rhetoric After Aristotle, volume VI

*The Passionate Intellect: Essays on the Transformation of Classical
Traditions presented to Professor I.G. Kidd,* volume VII

Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources, volume VIII

Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion, volume IX

*Rutgers University Studies
in Classical Humanities*

————— *Volume IX* —————

DEMETRIUS
————— *of* —————
PHALERUM

Text, Translation and Discussion

————— *Edited by* —————

William W. Fortenbaugh
Eckart Schütrumpf



Routledge

Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2000 by Transaction Publishers

Published 2017 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2000 by Taylor & Francis

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 99-042625

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Demetrius of Phalerum: text, translation, and discussion / edited by William W. Fortenbaugh and Eckart Schütrumpf.

p. cm. — (Rutgers University studies in classical humanities ; v. 9)

Includes Greek and Latin texts with facing English translation.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 0-7658-0017-9 (alk. paper)

1. Demetrius, of Phaleron, b. 350 B.C. 2. Philosophy, Ancient. I. Fortenbaugh, William W. II. Schütrumpf, Eckart. III. Demetrius, of Phaleron, b. 350 B.C. Selections. Polyglot. IV. Series

B557.D33 D46 1999

185—dc21

99-042625

CIP

ISBN 13: 978-0-7658-0017-6 (hbk)

Contents

Preface	vii
Contributors	ix
1. Demetrius of Phalerum: The Sources, Text and Translation <i>Peter Stork, Jan Max van Ophuijsen, Tiziano Dorandi</i>	1–310
2. Diogenes Laertius' Life of Demetrius of Phalerum <i>Michael J. Sollenberger</i>	311–329
3. Demetrius of Phalerum: Who was He and Who was He Not? <i>Stephen V. Tracy</i>	331–345
4. The Legislation of Demetrius of Phalerum and the Transformation of Athenian Law <i>Michael Gagarin</i>	347–365
5. Demetrius of Phalerum: A Politician among Philosophers and a Philosopher among Politicians <i>Hans B. Gottschalk</i>	367–380
6. Il Contributo dei Papiri alla Ricostruzione Biografia e delle Idee sulla Retorica di Demetrio del Falero <i>Tiziano Dorandi</i>	381–389
7. Demetrius of Phalerum on Literature <i>Franco Montanari</i>	391–411
8. Gli Aesopica de Demetrio Falereo <i>Elisabetta Matelli</i>	413–447
Index of Ancient Sources	449



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Preface

The series Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities (RUSCH) originated in close conjunction with Project Theophrastus. The latter, founded in the spring of 1981, had as its primary goal a new collection of the fragments of Theophrastus of Eresus, Aristotle's pupil and second head of the Peripatetic School. The former, RUSCH, was conceived of as a vehicle for making public the results of biennial meetings organized by Project Theophrastus. That plan has been adhered to with good results. Eight volumes of RUSCH have appeared since 1983. Seven are concerned either exclusively with Theophrastus or more generally with a theme of interest to scholars working on the Eresian. An eighth volume, no. 7 in the series, is a Festschrift honoring Ian Kidd, a loyal friend of Project Theophrastus.

In 1992 Project Theophrastus achieved its primary goal with the publication of *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*. Since then members of the Project have been working on nine commentaries of which two have appeared, both by Robert Sharples, a third by Pamela Huby is nearing publication. Biennial meetings have continued and one, that held in 1993, continued the focus on Theophrastus. After that a change occurred. Members of the Project recognized that the experience gained in working on Theophrastus might be directed toward other Peripatetics, whose fragments have not been collected and edited in a way that meets current philological standards. The existing collections made by Fritz Wehrli and published under the title *Die Schule des Aristoteles* are now forty years old. They are not complete and they lack a facing translation. To rectify this situation, it was decided to broaden the activities of the Project to include the colleagues and successors of Theophrastus. In fall 1995, a conference was held at the University of Colorado at Boulder under the direction of Eckart Schütrumpf. The subjects of discussion were Dicaearchus of Messene and Demetrius of Phalerum. This volume represents the first fruits of that gathering. It contains a new edition of

the fragments of Demetrius with facing English translation. Also included are the papers presented at Boulder. They are not intended as a systematic commentary on all the fragments of Demetrius. Rather they pick out issues of especial interest and offer a view peculiar to the author. The next volume of RUSCH will concern Dicaearchus and be similar in format.

We wish to thank the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Colorado for providing the space and funding necessary for a successful international conference. In addition, we want to acknowledge the editorial assistance of Catherine McKeen, Rutgers University, and the preparation of camera ready copy accomplished by Diane Smith, Waco, Texas.

WWF and ES

Contributors

Tiziano DORANDI, UPR 76, CNRS, 7 rue G. Moquet, BP 8, F-94801
Villejuif Cedex, France

Michael GAGARIN, Dept. of Classics, The University of Texas at
Austin, Austin, Texas 78712-1181, USA

Hans. B. GOTTSCHALK, University of Leeds, Dept. of Greek and
Latin, Leeds LS2 9JT, England

Elisabetta MATELLI, Istituto di Filologia Classica ed di Papirologia,
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 20123 Milano, Italia

Franco MONTANARI, Università di Genova, Dipartimento di Arche-
ologia e Filologia Classica, 16126 Genova, Italia

Jan Max VAN OPHUIJSEN, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, The Ameri-
can University of Beirut, c/o 850 Third Avenue, New York,
New York 10022, USA

Michael J. SOLLENBERGER, Dept. of Foreign Languages, Mt. St.
Marys College, Emmitsburg, Maryland 21727, USA

Peter STORK, Department of Classics, University of Leiden, Postbus
9515, 21300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

Stephen V. TRACY, Department of Classics, The Ohio State University,
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1319, USA



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

1

**Demetrius of Phalerum:
The Sources, Text and Translation**

*Peter Stork, Jan Max van Ophuijsen,
Tiziano Dorandi*

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED	11
TEXTS	
I. Life	
Ancient Biographies of Demetrius of Phalerum 1–3	24
Private Life	
Parentage 4	34
Outward Appearance 5	34
Wife 6	36
Demetrius, Grandson of Demetrius 7	36
Student and Associate of Theophrastus & Fellow Students 8–11	38
Public Life	
Embassy to Craterus 322 B.C. 12	42

2 Demetrius of Phalerum

Himeraeus, Brother of Demetrius, Killed in 322 B.C. 13A–B	42
Held in Great Renown 320 B.C. 14	44
Sentenced to Death 318 B.C. 15A–B	46
Epimeletes 317 B.C. 16A–B	46
Ten Years' Administration 317–307 B.C. 17–19	50
Lawgiver 317/6 B.C. 20A–B	54
The War between Antigonus and Cassander 314–311 B.C. 21–22	56
Eponymous Archon 309/8 B.C. 23A–E	58
Public Honors/Statues 24–25	60
Downfall 307 B.C. 26–31	66
Exile 32–34	74
Refuge in Egypt 35–41	78
Killed by an Asp 42	84
Profligate Living 43A–B	86
Demetrius and Menander 44	90
Of Uncertain Date 45–49	92
Demetrius Legislator	
Public Festivals 50	96
Census of the Athenians 51	96
Guardians of the Law 52	98
On Burials 53	100
Architecture 54	104
Homerists 55A–B	104
Judgments 56–57	106
Director of the Alexandrian Library	
The Alexandrian Library 58A–B	110
The Sacred Books of the Jews 59–66	112
Various Reports 67–69	128
II. Sayings 70–79	132
III. Writings	
Rhodian Book Catalogue 80	144
Ethics	
Titles of Books 81	144
On Fortune 82–83	146

On Old Age 84–85	152
On Dreams 86	152
Selection of Sayings (made) by Demetrius 87	154
Religion	164
Politics	
Titles of Books 88	166
Political Writings 89	168
Matters of Strategy 90–91	170
On Procedures and Offices of the State	
List of Archons 92–94	174
On Offices 95	176
On Procedures of the State 96–99	178
On Citizenship 100	186
On Foreigners 101	186
On individual Philosophers and Leaders of the State	
Socrates or Apology of Socrates 102–109	188
On Leaders and Generals of the Athenians 110–112	196
On Lycurgus 113	198
Miscellaneous	
On the Ship of Theseus 114	200
On Contests 115	200
On Mines 116A–B	202
On the Price of Sacrificial Animals 117	206
Speeches, Rhetoric and Poetics	
Titles of Books 118	208
Judgments on Demetrius' Elocution 119–125	210
On Rhetorical Training 126	216
On the Narration in Demetrius 127	218
On Figures as Used by Demetrius 128–129	220
Genres of Speeches 130	222
Orators <i>versus</i> Philosophers 131–132	224
Expression 133	230
Delivery 134–139	232
Athenian Orators 140	246
Fragments of Uncertain Provenience 141–142	246
Homerica 143–145	248

4 Demetrius of Phalerum

On Singers 146	252
Grammar and Orthography 147–148	254
Songs	256
Letters 149	256
Miscellaneous 150	256
IV. Uncertain 151–156	258
V. Spurious 157–161	264
VI. Not Accepted 162–176	270
CONCORDANCES	276
INDEX OF DEMETRIAN TEXTS	282
INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED	291
INDEX OF NAMES	303

INTRODUCTION

In presenting this edition of the fragments of Demetrius of Phalerum, we are responding to a growing interest in the Hellenistic period and in the philosophical schools of that age. The fragments of Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor and pupil, were published in 1992 (FHS&G); now we are publishing the fragments of Demetrius, Theophrastus' pupil and ruler of Athens from 317 to 307 B.C.

In general, the present edition is modeled on that of Theophrastus. In particular, the texts are divided into sections in accordance with their subject matter. In all there are six main sections: I. texts concerning the *Life* of Demetrius; II. texts containing *Sayings* attributed to Demetrius; III. texts concerning the *Writings* attributed to Demetrius; IV. texts of which the attribution to Demetrius is considered *Uncertain*; V. texts that appear to be *Spurious* in the sense that they have been falsely attributed to Demetrius; and VI. texts that have been attributed to Demetrius in earlier times (mainly in Ostermann's edition) and have been listed under the heading *Not Accepted* mainly for ease of reference.

Within the six main sections, subsections have been established. The texts concerning the *Life* of Demetrius (I) have been subdivided into *Ancient Biographies* (i.e., Diogenes Laertius and the *Suda*); texts concerning his *Private Life*; texts concerning his place within the *Peripatos*; texts concerning his *Public Life*, arranged in chronological order; texts concerning his activities as Legislator in Athens; texts concerning his (alleged) activities as *Director of the Alexandrian Library*; and texts containing *Various Reports* about him. The *Sayings* attributed to Demetrius have been collected as a separate group (II), placed between the texts concerning his Life (I) and those concerning his *Writings* (III). The texts concerning the *Writings* attributed to Demetrius (III) have tentatively been subdivided according to their subject matter under the headings *Ethics*, *Religion*, *Politics*, *Speeches-Rhetoric-Poetics*, *Songs*, *Letters* and *Miscellaneous*.

Arranging the texts under these headings has on the whole been relatively easy. A different matter, however, is that of assigning the texts to

specific writings and of arranging the transmitted titles of writings under the general headings. The difficulty here is that there are few texts in which a specific writing is cited by title, and that there are quite a few titles to which no text can be related. Hence, the heading *Miscellaneous* contains a relatively large number of titles. For the convenience of the user, the titles have been collected in a number of lists (**81, 88, 118, 149, 150**) with references to those texts in which titles are quoted explicitly. Furthermore, texts which (containing an explicit mention of the title) clearly belong to the same writing, have been placed together as much as possible in order to facilitate studying the contents of the writing.

By and large the distinction between texts concerning the *Life* (I) and those concerning the *Sayings* (II), on the one hand, and those concerning the *Writings* (III), on the other, corresponds to the traditional distinction between *testimonia* and *fragmenta*. This correspondence is not, however, complete; thus, for instance, the texts containing *Judgments on Demetrius' Elocution* (**119–125**) have been placed under the heading *Speeches, Rhetoric and Poetics* in the *Writings* (III) to effect a greater coherence of subject matter.

The texts are numbered from **1** to **176**. Sometimes a number covers several texts which are distinguished by letters (A, B, C, etc.). These texts refer to the same specific subject matter (in that sense they are *parallel texts*), but they supply information which is significantly different and for that reason they are quoted in full. Partly as a result of this, the total number of texts (176) is considerably less than the total number in Wehrli's edition (204), the other reason being that a bare title is not given a separate number, as it often is in Wehrli's edition.

In editing the texts, the editors have taken as their starting-point the text of an existing recent edition (mentioned in the heading of the text with line numbers of the edition used). This does not, however, mean that the text printed here is always identical to that of the source edition. There are changes which are accounted for in the *lower* or *critical apparatus*, and which reflect our editorial policy. In the case of an edition of fragments, problems relating to the constitution of the text ought, in the opinion of the editors, to be made perfectly clear to the user and not be

glossed over in order to effect an 'easy' reading. The two most important cases are *lacunae* (especially in inscriptions or papyri, where editors often print or suggest supplements) and *emendations* (especially in literary texts, where sometimes an emendation might make it easy to forget that the text printed has been altered by a modern scholar). This is not merely a matter of editorial finesse, for sometimes the passage affected may contain essential information (e.g., **16B** with a lacuna in an inscription, and **51** with emendations of a literary text). Thus, *lacunae* have been left as they are, and sometimes *cruces* have been used to signal corruption, where other editors might print an emended text.

The *texts* as printed in this edition are based upon the information supplied in the editions used and no original research on the *paradosis* has been done by the editors, with the following exceptions. All texts from Diogenes Laertius (**1, 10, 33B, 48, 49, 84, 85, 93, 94, 106, 107, 108, 109**) are based upon collations made by Tiziano Dorandi in preparing a new edition of the *Vitae Philosophorum*. All papyri texts (**37, 41, 130, 131A, 131B, 131C, 132, 134, 135C, 141, 142**) are based upon inspection of the papyri by Tiziano Dorandi or colleagues of his. In the case of the two Strabo texts (**19, 116A**), Professor Stefan L. Radt of Groningen University, The Netherlands, who is preparing a new edition of the *Geographica*, has generously put at our disposal the text with *apparatus criticus* as constituted by him. In the case of the inscriptions (**16B, 23C, 46, 151, 152, 162**), Stephen V. Tracy has very kindly checked the texts printed here against the 'squeezes' which are at his disposal.

The *upper apparatus* includes at least four kinds of information. First, there are references to the corresponding *testimonia* and *fragmenta* in F. Jacoby's edition of the *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (FGrH) no. 228, II B 956–73. References to Wehrli's edition are given in the left margin of the Greek text at the line where Wehrli's fragment begins. Second, there are parallel texts, i.e. first of all parallel texts in the strict sense which explicitly mention Demetrius of Phalerum (the line numbers of the edition used are always added in these cases), but also parallel texts in a wider sense which, without referring to Demetrius, contain information that seems to be particularly relevant to the interpretation of the text (the passage or text is merely cited in these

cases and often introduced by means of *cf.*). Third, references are given to modern editions or collections of fragments of authors mentioned in the text. Fourth, there are cross-references by means of numbers in bold type to other texts in the present collection in order to assist the user in collecting information quickly and easily.

The *translation* tries to effect the impossible in being readable and at the same time as close to the original as possible. Without unduly begging the reader's indulgence on this point, the editors would like to point out that ironically enough among the five scholars who worked on the translation, there is only one native speaker of (American) English.

The *notes to the translation* serve two purposes. First, they may supply (often quite basic) information which will assist the user in understanding and interpreting the text or, particularly in the case of the 'historical' testimonia, in placing it in its historical context. Second, they place the text within the wider context of the work from which it has been taken. Although the notes are not intended as a full commentary, they are fuller than they would be if the editors were planning to add a companion volume containing a commentary.

Tables of *Abbreviations* and of *Editions Used* have been provided. All abbreviations not found in these tables are those of *LSJ*. The *Concordances* relate the texts in this edition to the editions of F. Wehrli (1968), F. Jacoby (1926), C. Müller (1878) and Chr. Ostermann (1857). The *Index of Demetrian Texts* lists all Demetrian texts in the strict sense of the word, i.e. all texts explicitly mentioning Demetrius of Phalerum, printed here as a text (indicated by means of numbers in bold type) or entered in a list, and all parallel texts in the strict sense, i.e. all parallel texts explicitly mentioning Demetrius of Phalerum, entered in the upper apparatus. All other passages cited in the upper (or lower) apparatus and in the notes to the translation are listed in the *Index of Passages Cited*. Finally, it is hoped that the *Index of Names* to the translation will help the user in finding his way through the fragments more quickly.

Work on this edition began early in 1994, when Bill Fortenbaugh suggested to Jan van Ophuijsen that he prepare a working translation of the fragments as collected by Wehrli for the Conference of Project

Theophrastus, which was to be held in Boulder, Colorado in September 1995. Later that year when Jan accepted an appointment at the American University of Beirut, which does not have a Classics department and whose library holdings in this field are accordingly limited, he found Peter Stork willing to share this assignment, and in the end it was Peter who not only translated some two-thirds of the material but also prepared a working edition of the expanded Greek and Latin texts. This edition-cum-translation, after being overhauled by Bill Fortenbaugh, was placed at the disposal of those who participated in the Ninth Conference of Project Theophrastus which was hosted by Eckart Schütrumpf, at the University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado, September 7–10, 1995. After the conference Peter Stork submitted a number of revised and expanded versions to Tiziano Dorandi, Bill Fortenbaugh, Jan van Ophuijsen, and Eckart Schütrumpf. Apart from editing all texts of Diogenes Laertius and all papyri, Tiziano Dorandi has been a constant source of critical advice on technical matters relating to the editing of the texts, as Bill Fortenbaugh has been on those relating to the translation and general editorial technique. Eckart Schütrumpf played a pivotal part in establishing a new arrangement of the fragments, and scrutinized part of the translations. And at the end of the journey Jan van Ophuijsen went through the completed material, combing out remaining oversights and suggesting improvements.

Stephen V. Tracy, in addition to being responsible for the reassignment of an important text (162), has generously put at our disposal his expertise in matters inscriptional. Besides checking the readings of the inscriptions against his ‘squeezes’, he has given advice on placing the various inscriptions, including some intriguing new material, in the different sections and on arranging the ‘historical’ testimonia. Michael G. Sollenberger has helped with acute comments on the translation, particularly on that of Diogenes Laertius’ *Life of Demetrius*.

Work on this edition has been made considerably easier by the facilities offered by the CD ROM disk #D of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* and the Packard Humanities Institute CD ROM disks #5.3 (Latin Texts) and #7 (Inscriptions and Papyri).

Although this edition, then, is the result of collaboration between a number of scholars coming from quite different fields of expertise and

quite different parts of the world, the bulk of the actual editing has been done by Peter Stork, who therefore holds himself responsible for any technical shortcomings that remain. In token of this close collaboration, the editors would very much appreciate the present edition being referred to by means of the abbreviation 'SOD'.

Finally, the editors acknowledge a debt of gratitude to the other contributors to the present volume for their patience in waiting for its publication.

ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED

The list under (a) explains the abbreviations used in this collection to refer to other standard collections and scholarly journals; that under (b) lists the text editions used in this collection; that under (c) explains the other abbreviations used; and that under (d) explains the symbols used in the apparatus of this collection.

(a) Names, Standard Collections, Scholarly Journals etc.

AD	Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον. Ἀθῆναι
Agora	<i>The Athenian Agora</i> . Vol. III <i>Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia</i> by R.E. Wycherley; Vol. XIX <i>Inscriptions</i> by G.V. Lalonde, M.K. Langdon, M.B. Walbank. Princeton NJ 1957. 1991
AM	<i>Athenische Mitteilungen</i>
Ann. Rom.	<i>L'Annalistique Romaine</i> . Tome I <i>Les Annales des Pontifes et l'Annalistique Ancienne (Fragments)</i> ed. M. Chassignet. Paris 1996 [CB]
AP	<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>
APF	J.K. Davies, <i>Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.</i> Oxford 1971
AR	<i>Archaeological Reports</i> . British School at Athens
ASA	<i>Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente</i>
Bayer DPhA	E. Bayer, <i>Demetrios Phalereus der Athener</i> . Darmstadt 1969
BCH	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</i>
BGMA	<i>Bibliotheca Graeca Medii Aevi</i> . Vol. 7. Venice 1894
BT	<i>Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana</i> . Leipzig B.G. Teubner
CA	<i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i> ed. J.U. Powell. Oxford 1925
CB	<i>Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé</i> . Paris Les Belles Lettres
CC	<i>Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina</i>
CGF	<i>Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> ed. G. Kaibel. Vol. 1.1 Berlin ² 1954 (1899)
CPF	<i>Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini. Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina</i> . Parte I: <i>Autori Noti</i> . Vol. 1**. Firenze 1992
CPG	<i>Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum</i> edd. E.L. Leutsch, F.G. Schneidewin. 2 vols. Göttingen 1839. 1851
CR	<i>Classical Review</i>
CRIPEL	<i>Cahiers de Recherches de l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Égyptologie de Lille</i>
Croenert	W. Crönert, <i>Kolotes und Menedemos</i> . Leipzig 1906

12 Demetrius of Phalerum

CSHB	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae</i>
CSLP	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum</i>
Curse Tablets	J.G. Gager, <i>Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World</i> . Oxford 1992
Diehl III ³	<i>Anthologia Lyrica Graeca</i> ed. E. Diehl. Vol. 3 <i>Iamborum Scriptores</i> . Leipzig ³ 1952 [BT]
Dittenberger Syll. ³	<i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> ed. W. Dittenberger. 3 vols. Leipzig 1915. 1917. 1920
DK	<i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> edd. H. Diels, W. Kranz. 3 vols. Berlin ⁶ 1951. ⁶ 1952. ⁶ 1952
Dow and Travis	St. Dow and A.H. Travis, 'Demetrios of Phaleron and his Lawgiving,' <i>Hesperia</i> 12 (1943) 144–65
Drerup	E. Drerup, <i>Demosthenes im Urteile des Altertums</i> . Würzburg 1923
EG	<i>Epistolographi Graeci</i> ed. R. Hercher. Paris 1873
EpGF	<i>Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> ed. M. Davies. Göttingen 1988
FGrH	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> ed. F. Jacoby. Leiden 1926–58
FHG	<i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> ed. C. Müller. Paris 1841–70
FHS&G	<i>Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence</i> , edd. W.W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby, R.W. Sharples, D. Gutas. 2 vols. Leiden 1992
FPhG	<i>Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum</i> ed. Fr.W.A. Mullach. 2 vols. Paris 1860. 1867
GGA	<i>Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen</i> . Berlin
GCS	<i>Die Griechischen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte</i> . Berlin
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
GRF	<i>Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta</i> ed. H. Funaioli. Vol. 1. Leipzig 1907
Habicht Athen	Chr. Habicht, <i>Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit</i> . München 1995
Hansen Demography	M.H. Hansen, <i>Demography and Democracy. The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C.</i> Herning 1986
HRR	<i>Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae</i> ed. H. Peter. Vol. 1. Leipzig 1914
HT	<i>Heidelberger Texte Lateinische Reihe</i>
Hume	D. Hume, 'On the Populousness of Ancient Nations,' in: <i>Essays Moral, Political and Literary</i> 1752
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>
Jacoby MP	<i>Das Marmor Parium</i> ed. F. Jacoby. Berlin 1904
JClPh	<i>Jahrbücher für classische Philologie</i> herausgegeben von Alfred Fleckeisen
Jordan	D.R. Jordan, 'A Survey of Greek Defixiones Not Included in the Special Corpora,' <i>GRBS</i> 26 (1985) 151–97
Kaibel	<i>De Comoedia Graeca Commentaria Vetera</i> in <i>CGF</i> Vol. 1.1. Berlin ² 1958 (1899)

Keil	B. Keil, EIPHNH. <i>Eine philologisch-antiquarische Untersuchung</i> . Leipzig 1916
LG	<i>Lexicographi Graeci</i> . Leipzig
Martini RE	E. Martini, s.v. Demetrios no. 85, RE 4 (1901) 2817–41
MDAI(A)	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung</i>
MG	<i>Mythographi Graeci</i>
MH	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
Mylonas Eleusis	G.E. Mylonas, <i>Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries</i> . Princeton NJ 1961
N. ²	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> ed. A. Nauck. Leipzig ² 1889 (with suppl. ed. B. Snell. Hildesheim 1964)
NSERC	A. Maiuri, <i>Nuova Silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos</i> . Firenze 1925
OCT	<i>Oxford Classical Texts</i> . Oxford Clarendon Press
Overbeck	<i>Die Antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen</i> ed. J. Overbeck. Leipzig 1868
PA	<i>Prosopographia Attica</i> ed. J. Kirchner. 2 vols. Berlin 1901–03
PCG	<i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> edd. R. Kassel et C. Austin. Berlin/New York 1983–
PG	<i>Patrologia cursus completus, series Graeca</i> ed. J.P. Migne. Paris 1857–66
P.Herc.	Papyrus Herculaneensis
PMG	<i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> ed. D.L. Page. Oxford 1962
PPhF	<i>Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta</i> ed. H. Diels. Berlin 1901
PSI	<i>Papiri della Società Italiana</i>
PVTG	<i>Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece</i>
RE	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
REG	<i>Revue des Études Grecques</i>
RFIC	<i>Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica</i>
RhG	<i>Rhetores Graeci</i> ed. Chr. Walz. Stuttgart/Tübingen. Vol. 2 1835; Vol. 7.2 1834
RhGr	<i>Rhetores Graeci</i> ed. L. Spengel. 3 vols. Leipzig 1853. 1854. 1856 <i>Rhetores Graeci</i> ed. L. Spengel. Vol. 1 ed. C. Hammer. Leipzig 1894 <i>Rhetores Graeci</i> Vol. 14 <i>Prolegomenon Sylloge</i> ed. H. Rabe. Leipzig 1931
RhLM	<i>Rhetores Latini Minores</i> ed. C. Halm. Leipzig 1863
RhM	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
Robert OMS	L. Robert, <i>Opera minora selecta</i> . Vol. 1. Amsterdam 1969
RS	<i>Roman Statutes</i> ed. M.H. Crawford. Vol. 2. London 1996
RUSCH	<i>Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities</i>
SA	<i>Scholia in Aristophanem</i> edd. W.J.W. Koster, D. Holwerda. Groningen
SC	<i>Sources Chrétiennes</i>
SGL	<i>Scriptores Graeci et Latini consilio Academiae Lynceorum editi</i> . Rome

14 Demetrius of Phalerum

<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>
<i>SH</i>	<i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> edd. H. Lloyd-Jones, P. Parsons. Berlin/New York 1983
<i>SOEM</i>	K. Clinton, <i>The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries</i> . Philadelphia 1974
<i>SSR</i>	<i>Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae</i> ed. G. Giannantoni. Vols. 1, 2. Napoli 1990
<i>SVF</i>	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> ed. J. von Arnim. Vol. 3 <i>Chrysippi Fragmenta Moralia. Fragmenta Successorum Chrysippi</i> . Leipzig 1903
Tracy <i>ADT</i>	Stephen V. Tracy, <i>Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.</i> Berkeley 1995
<i>TrGF</i>	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> Vol. 1. edd. B. Snell, R. Kannicht. Göttingen ² 1986
Wehrli	<i>Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar</i> herausgegeben von Fritz Wehrli. Band 4 <i>Demetrios von Phaleron</i> . Basel/Stuttgart ² 1968
West <i>GM</i>	M.L. West, <i>Greek Metre</i> . Oxford 1982
Whitehead <i>Demes</i>	D. Whitehead, <i>The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca. 250 B.C. A Political and Social Study</i> . Princeton 1986
Wilamowitz <i>KS</i>	U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, <i>Kleine Schriften</i> . IV <i>Lesefrüchte und Verwandtes</i> . Berlin 1962

(b) Editions Used

Ael. <i>VH</i>	<i>Claudii Aeliani Varia Historia</i> ed. M. R. Dilts. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
Aesopica	<i>Aesopica</i> ed. B. E. Perry. Vol. 1 <i>Greek and Latin Texts</i> . Urbana 1952
Ammonius	<i>Ammonius in Aristotelis De Interpretatione Commentarius</i> ed. A. Busse (= <i>Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca</i> . Vol. 4.5 <i>Ammonius de Interpretatione</i>). Berlin 1897
Ampelius	<i>Lucii Ampelii Liber Memoralis</i> ed. E. Assmann. Leipzig 1935 [BT]
An. Bachm.	<i>Anecdota Graeca</i> ed. L. Bachmann. Vol. 1. Leipzig 1828
AB	<i>Anecdota Graeca</i> ed. I. Bekker. Vol. 1 <i>Lexica Segueriana</i> . Berlin 1814
	<i>Anecdota Graeca</i> ed. P. Matranga. 2 vols. Rome 1850
An. Ox.	<i>Anecdota Graeca e codd. mss. Biblioth. Oxon.</i> ed. J.A. Cramer. Oxford Vol. 2 1835; Vol. 3 1836
An. Par.	<i>Anecdota Graeca e codd. mss. Biblioth. Reg. Paris.</i> ed. J.A. Cramer. Vol. 1. Oxford 1939
Anon. Matr.	Anonymus Matritensis: <i>Anonymi Chronographia Syntomos</i> ed. A. Bauer. Leipzig 1909 [BT]
Anton.	<i>Antonii Monachi cognomento Melissae Loci Communes</i> ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1865 [PG 136]

App. Gnom.	<i>Appendix Gnomica</i> ed. L. Sternbach, in: <i>Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci Wydzial Filologiczny</i> 2,5 (1894) Krakowie, p. 29–52
App. Vat. I	<i>Appendix Vaticana I</i> ed. L. Sternbach, in: <i>Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci Wydzial Filologiczny</i> 2,5 (1894) Krakowie, p. 171–202
Arethas	<i>Arethae Archiepiscopi Caesariensis Scripta Minora</i> . Vol. 1 ed. L.G. Westerink. Leipzig 1968 [BT]
Aristeas	<i>Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula</i> ed. P. Wendland. Leipzig 1900 [BT]
Aristid. Or.	<i>P. Aelii Aristidis Opera quae exstant omnia</i> . Vol. 1 ed. F.W. Lenz. Leiden 1978
Aristipp.	<i>Aristippi et Cyrenaicorum Fragmenta</i> ed. E. Mannebach. Leiden/Köln 1961 (Suppl. II: <i>De Theodoro Atheo</i> 58–63)
Aristobul.	<i>Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum Historicorum et Auctorum Iudaeorum Hellenistarum Fragmentis</i> ed. A.-M. Denis. Leiden 1970 [PVTG 3]
Arist. Fragmenta	<i>Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition</i> by I. Düring. Göteborg 1957 <i>Aristotelis Opera</i> . Vol. 3 <i>Librorum deperditorum Fragmenta</i> ed. O. Gigon. Berlin/New York 1987 <i>Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta</i> ed. W.D. Ross. Oxford 1955
Aristox.	<i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 2 <i>Aristoxenos</i> . Basel/Stuttgart ² 1967
Arr. Hist. succ. Alex.	<i>Historia successorum Alexandri: Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia</i> ed. A.G. Roos. Vol. 2 <i>Scripta Minora et Fragmenta</i> ed. G. Wirth. Leipzig 1968 [BT]
Ars.	ΑΡΣΕΝΙΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΑ. <i>Arsenii Violetum</i> ed. Chr. Walz. Stuttgart 1832
Artem.	<i>Artemidori Daldiani Onirocriticon Libri V</i> ed. R.A. Pack. Leipzig 1963 [BT]
Ath.	<i>Athenaei Naucratis Dipnosophistarum Libri XV</i> ed. G. Kaibel. Leipzig 3 vols. 1887. 1887. 1890 [BT]
Epit.	<i>Athenaei Dipnosophistarum Epitome</i> ed. S.P. Peppink. Vols. 2.1, 2.2. Leiden 1937. 1939
Bion	J.F. Kindstrand, <i>Bion of Borysthenes. A Collection of the Fragments with Introduction and Commentary</i> . Uppsala 1976
Caec. Cal.	<i>Caecilii Calactini Fragmenta</i> ed. E. Ofenloch. Leipzig 1907 [BT]
Cic. Brut.	<i>M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia</i> . Vol. 4 <i>Brutus</i> ed. H. Malcovati. Leipzig 1965 [BT]
De Or.	—Vol. 3 <i>De Oratore</i> ed. K.F. Kumaniecki. Leipzig 1969 [BT]
Or.	—Vol. 5 <i>Orator</i> ed. R. Westman. Leipzig 1980 [BT]
Fin.	—Vol. 13 <i>De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum Libri Quinque</i> ed. Th. Schiche. Leipzig 1919 [BT]
Rab. Post.	—Vol. 25 <i>Orationes Pro Cn. Plancio, Pro C. Rabirio Postumo</i> ed. E. Olechowska. Leipzig 1981 [BT]

16 Demetrius of Phalerum

<i>Div.</i>	—Vol. 46 <i>De Divinatione. De Fato. Timaeus</i> ed. R. Giomini. Leipzig 1975 [BT]
<i>Leg.</i>	<i>M. Tullius Cicero De Legibus</i> ed. K. Ziegler. 3. Auflage ed. W. Görler. Freiburg/Würzburg 1979 [HT]
<i>Off.</i>	<i>M. Tulli Ciceronis De Officiis</i> ed. M. Winterbottom. Oxford 1994 [OCT]
<i>Rep.</i>	<i>Cicéron. La République. Vol. 2 Livres II–VI</i> ed. E. Bréguet. Paris 1980 [CB]
<i>Fam.</i>	<i>M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae ad Familiares Libri I–XVI</i> ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Stuttgart 1988 [BT]
Cicero, Q. Tullius	<i>M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem, Epistulae ad M. Brutum, accedunt Commentariolum Petitionis, Fragmenta Epistularum</i> ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Stuttgart 1988 [BT]
Clem. Al. <i>Strom.</i>	<i>Clemens Alexandrinus. Vol. 2: Stromata Buch I–VI</i> edd. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel. Berlin ³ 1960 [GCS]
Comoedia, Proleg. de	<i>Prolegomena De Comoedia</i> ed. W.J.W. Koster. Groningen 1975 [SA 1.1A] <i>Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> ed. G. Kaibel. Vol. 1.1 <i>Doriensium Comoedia, Mimi, Phlyaces</i> . Berlin ² 1958
Cosmas Indicopl.	<i>The Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes</i> ed. E.O. Winstedt. Cambridge 1909
Crantor	H.J. Mette, 'Zwei Akademiker heute: Krantor und Arkesilaos,' <i>Lustrum</i> 26 (1984) 7–94
Cyrillus	<i>Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Hierosolymitani Opera Quae Exstant Omnia</i> ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1893 [PG 33]
Demetrius Ixion	T. Staesche, <i>De Demetrio Ixione Grammatico</i> . Diss. Halle 1883
Demetr. Magn.	Jørgen Mejer, 'Demetrius of Magnesia: On Poets and Authors of the Same Name,' <i>Hermes</i> 109 (1981) 447–72
Demetrius Phalereus	Chr. Ostermann, <i>Commentationis de Demetrii Phalerei vita, rebus gestis et scriptorum reliquiis</i> . Part. I. Hersfeld 1847 (<i>Jahresbericht über das Kurfürstliche Gymnasium zu Hersfeld</i> , 1–64). <i>De Demetrii Phalerii vita, rebus gestis et scriptorum reliquiis</i> . Part. II. Fulda 1857 (<i>Programm des Kurfürstlichen Gymnasiums zu Fulda</i> , 1–48)
Demetrius Rhetor	<i>Demetrii Phalerei qui dicitur De Elocutione Libellus</i> ed. L. Radermacher. Stuttgart 1967 [BT]
Demetrius Rhetor	<i>Demetrii et Libanii qui feruntur ΤΥΠΟΙ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΙ et ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΜΑΙΟΙ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΕΣ</i> ed. V. Weichert. Leipzig 1910 [BT]
Demetrius Sceptisus Dicaearch.	<i>Demetrii Sceptsii quae supersunt</i> ed. R. Gaede, Greifswald 1880 <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 1 <i>Dikaiarchos</i> . Basel/Stuttgart ² 1967 <i>Dicaearchus of Messene: The Sources, Text and Translation</i> by David C. Mirhady, in: <i>RUSCH</i> 10
Did.	<i>Didymi Chalcenteri Grammatici Alexandrini Fragmenta Quae Supersunt Omnia</i> ed. M. Schmidt. Leipzig 1854

Din.	<i>Dinarchi Orationes cum fragmentis</i> ed. N.C. Conomis. Leipzig 1975
D.Chr. Or.	<i>Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia</i> ed. J. von Arnim. Vol. 2. Berlin 1896
D.S.	<i>Diodori Bibliotheca Historica</i> ed. C. Th. Fischer. Vols. 4, 5. Leipzig 1906 [BT] —Vol. 6. Stuttgart 1969 (1867/1868) [BT]
Diog. Apoll.	André Laks, <i>Diogène d'Apollonie. La dernière cosmologie présocratique</i> . Lille 1983
D.L.	<i>Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum</i> ed. H.S. Long. 2 vols. Oxford 1964 [OCT]
D.H. Isoc.	<i>Denys d'Halicarnasse. Opusculs Rhétoriques</i> . Vol. 1 <i>Les Orateurs Antiques</i> . Paris 1978 [CB]
Dem.	—Vol. 2 <i>Démosthène</i> . Paris 1988 [CB]
Pomp., Din.	—Vol. 5 <i>L'Imitation. Première Lettre à Ammée. Lettre à Pompée Géminos. Dinarque</i> . Paris 1992 [CB]
Epicurus	<i>Epicurea</i> ed. H. Usener. Leipzig 1887
Epiphanius	E.D. Moutsoulas, 'Τὸ «Περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν» ἔργον Ἐπιφανίου τοῦ Σαλαμινίου,' <i>Θεολογία</i> 44 (1973) 157–98
EM	<i>Etymologicum Magnum</i> ed. Th. Gaisford. Oxford 1848
Eubulus	<i>Eubulus. The Fragments</i> ed. R.L. Hunter. Cambridge 1983
Euclides	<i>Die Megariker. Kommentierte Sammlung der Testimonien</i> ed. K. Döring. Amsterdam 1972
Eudocia Augusta	<i>Eudociae Augustae Violarium</i> ed. I. Flach. Leipzig 1880 [BT]
Euhemerus	<i>Euhemeri Messenii Reliquiae</i> ed. M. Winiarczyk. Leipzig 1991 [BT]
Eur. Fragmenta	H.J. Mette, 'Euripides (insbesondere für die Jahre 1939-1968). Erster Hauptteil: Die Bruchstücke,' <i>Lustrum</i> 12 (1967) 5–288; 13 (1968) 289–403
Eus. PE	<i>Eusebius Werke</i> . Vol. 8 <i>Die Praeparatio Evangelica</i> ed. K. Mras. Vols. 1. 2. Berlin 1954. 1956 [GCS]
Eust. Il.	<i>Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem</i> ed. M. van der Valk. Vol. 1 (A–Δ); Vol. 3 (K–Π); Vol. 4 (P–Ω) Leiden-New York-København-Köln 1971. 1979. 1987
Od.	<i>Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam</i> ed. G. Stallbaum. Leipzig 1825
Exc. Const. De sent.	<i>Excerpta Historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta</i> edd. U. Ph. Boissevain, C. De Boor, Th. Büttner-Wobst. Vol. 2 <i>Excerpta De sententiis</i> ed. U.Ph. Boissevain. Berlin 1906
De Virt. et Vit.	<i>Excerpta Historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta</i> edd. U. Ph. Boissevain, C. De Boor, Th. Büttner-Wobst. Vol. 2 <i>Excerpta De virtutibus et vitiis</i> . Pars 1 edd. Th. Büttner-Wobst et A.G. Roos. Pars 2 ed. A.G. Roos. Berlin 1906. 1910
Exc. Flor.	<i>Excerpta Florentina</i> , in: <i>Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium</i> ed. A. Meineke. Vol. 4. Leipzig 1857, 149–246 [BT]

18 Demetrius of Phalerum

Exc. Par.	L. Sternbach, 'Excerpta Parisina,' <i>Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci Wydzial Filologiczny</i> 2,5 (1894) Krakowie, 53–82
Favorinus	<i>Favorino di Arelate. Opere</i> ed. A. Barigazzi. Firenze 1966 <i>Favorin von Arelate. Der erste Teil der Fragmente. Memorabilien und Omnigena Historia</i> ed. E. Mensching. Berlin 1963
Flor. Leid.	<i>Florilegium Leidense</i> ed. L.R. Beynen. Diss. Leiden 1837
Flor. Mon.	<i>Florilegium Monacense</i> , in: <i>Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium</i> ed. A. Meineke. Vol. 4. Leipzig 1857, 267–90 [BT] and in: <i>Arsenii Violetum</i> ed. Walz, 494–512
Flor. Ottobon.	<i>Florilegium Ottobonianum</i> : Ottobonianus Graecus 192
Flor. Pal.	<i>Florilegium Palatinum</i> (Palatinus Graecus 356) ed. C. Wachsmuth, 'De Gnomologio Palatino Inedito' (= <i>Commentatio ex satura philologa Hermanno Sauppio oblata seorsum expressa</i>) 1879
Flor. Pal.-Vat.	<i>Florilegium Palatinum-Vaticanum</i> : cod. Palatinus Graecus 369
Georgius Cedrenus	<i>Georgius Cedrenus</i> ed. I. Bekker. Vol. 1 <i>Historiarum Compendium</i> . Bonn 1838
Georgius Monachus	<i>Chronicon Breve quod ex variis chronographiis et expositoribus decerpsit concinnavitque Georgius Monachus cognomine Hamartolus</i> ed. Ed. De Muralto. Paris 1863 [PG 110]
Georgius Syncellus	<i>Georgii Syncelli Ecloga Chronographica</i> ed. A.A. Mosshammer. Leipzig 1984 [BT]
Gnom. Basil.	<i>Gnomica Basileensia</i> ed. J.F. Kindstrand. Uppsala 1991
Gnom. Byz.	<i>Gnomologium Byzantinum</i> ed. C. Wachsmuth, <i>Studien zu den Griechischen Florilegien</i> . Berlin 1882, 162–207
Gnom. Pal.	<i>Gnomologium Palatinum</i> ed. C. Wachsmuth, 'De Gnomologio Palatino Inedito' (= <i>Commentatio ex satura philologa Hermanno Sauppio oblata seorsum expressa</i>) 1879
Gnom. Vat.	<i>Gnomologium Vaticanum e codice Vaticano Graeco 743</i> ed. L. Sternbach. Berlin 1963
Harp.	<i>Harpocraton Lexeis of the Ten Orators</i> ed. J.J. Keaney. Amsterdam 1991
Heracl. Pont.	<i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 7 <i>Herakleides Pontikos</i> . Basel/Stuttgart ² 1969
Hermipp.	<i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> ed. F. Wehrli. Suppl. 1 <i>Hermippos der Kallimacheer</i> . Basel/Stuttgart 1974
Hes.	<i>Fragmenta Hesiodica</i> edd. R. Merkelbach, M.L. West. Oxford 1967
Hdn.	Herodianus, <i>De prosodia</i> ed. A. Lentz, in: <i>Grammatici Graeci</i> 3.1. Leipzig 1867
Hsch.	Hesychius, <i>Lexicon</i> ed. K. Latte. Vol. 1 (A–Δ), Vol. 2 (E–O). Copenhagen 1953. 1956; ed. M. Schmidt. Vol. 3 (A–P), Vol. 4 (Σ–Ω). Jena 1861. 1868
Ps.-Hsch. Mil.	<i>Hesychii Milesii qui fertur De Viris Illustribus Librum</i> ed. I. Flach. Leipzig 1880 [BT]
Hieronym.	<i>Die Chronik des Hieronymus. Hieronymi Chronicon</i> ed. R. Helm. Berlin 1956 (= <i>Eusebius Werke</i> , 7) [GCS 24]

Hieronymus Rhodius	<i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 10 <i>Hieronymos von Rhodos</i> . Basel/Stuttgart ² 1969
Hyper.	<i>Hyperidis Orationes Sex</i> ed. Chr. Jensen. Leipzig 1917
Ibn Abi Usaibia	<i>Uyun al-anba fi tabaqat al-atibba: Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition</i> by I. Düring. Göteborg 1957
Irenaeus	<i>Irénée de Lyon. Contre les Hérésies Livre III.</i> edd A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau. Vol. 2 <i>Texte et Traduction</i> . Paris 1974 [SC]
Isidorus Orig.	<i>Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX</i> ed. W.M. Lindsay. Vol. 1. Oxford 1911
Iul. Vict. <i>Rhet.</i>	<i>C. Iulii Victoris Ars Rhetorica</i> edd. R. Giomini, M.S. Celentano. Leipzig 1980 [BT]
Jos. <i>AJ</i>	<i>Flavii Iosephi Opera</i> ed. B. Niese. Vol. 3 <i>Antiquitatum Iudaicarum Libri XI–XV</i> . Berlin 1892
Ap.	—Vol. 5 <i>De Iudaeorum Vetustate sive Contra Apionem Libri II</i> . Berlin 1889
Leo Grammaticus	<i>Leonis Grammatici Chronographia</i> ed. I. Bekker. Bonn 1842 [CSHB]
Lexica Segueriana	4 Δικῶν ὀνόματα = <i>Anecdota Graeca</i> ed. I. Bekker [AB] 1.181–94 5 Λέξεις Ῥητορικαί = <i>Anecdota Graeca</i> ed. I. Bekker [AB] 1.195–318
Lex. <i>Rhet. Cant.</i>	<i>Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense</i> ed. E.O. Houtsma. Leiden 1870
Lex. <i>Sabb.</i>	<i>Lexicon Sabbaiticum</i> ed. A. Papadopulos-Kerameus. Petersburg 1892 (in: <i>Lexica Graeca Minora</i> edd. K. Latte, H. Erbse. Hildesheim 1965, 39–60)
Lex. <i>Vind.</i>	<i>Lexicon Vindobonense</i> ed. A. Nauck. St. Petersburg 1867
Malalas	<i>Ioannis Malalae Chronographia</i> ed. L. Dindorf. Bonn 1831 [CSHB]
Marcellinus	<i>Thucydidis Historiae</i> ed. J.B. Alberti. Vol. 1 <i>Libri I–II</i> . Rome 1972 [SGL]
Marcus Aurelius	<i>Marci Aurelii Antonini Ad se ipsum Libri XII</i> ed. J. Dalfen. Leipzig 1979 [BT]
Max.	Maximi Abbatis, <i>Capita Theologica scite Dicta atque Electa</i> , ed. R.P.F. Combefis. Paris 1865 [PG 91]
Men. <i>Fragmenta</i>	<i>Menandri quae supersunt</i> . Vol. 2 <i>Reliquiae apud veteres Scriptores servatae</i> ed. A. Körte (A. Thierfelder). Leipzig ² 1959 [BT]
Nepos	<i>Cornelii Nepotis Vitae cum Fragmentis</i> ed. P.K. Marshall. Leipzig 1977 [BT]
Nilus <i>Mal. Cog.</i>	<i>De malignis Cogitationibus</i> ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1860 [PG 79]
Non.	<i>Nonii Marcelli De Conpendiosa Doctrina Libros XX</i> ed. W.M. Lindsay. Vol. 3. Leipzig 1903 [BT]
Panaetius	<i>Panaetii Rhodii Fragmenta</i> ed. M. van Straaten. Leiden 1952 <i>Panezio di Rodi. Testimonianze</i> ed. F. Alesse. Naples 1997
Parth.	<i>Parthenii Libellus</i> Περὶ Ἐρωτικῶν Παθημάτων ed. P. Sakolowski. Leipzig 1896 [MG 2.1]

- Pausanias *Pausanias. Graeciae Descriptio* ed. M.H. Rocha-Pereira. Vol. 1 *Libri I–IV*. Leipzig 1989 [BT]
- Phaedrus *Phaedri Augusti Liberti Liber Fabularum* ed. A. Guaglianone. Torino 1969 [CSLP]
- Phld. Rh. *Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica* ed. S. Sudhaus. Leipzig 1982 [BT]
- Phot. Bibl. *Photius. Bibliothèque* ed. R. Henry. Vols. 2, 8. Paris 1960. 1977 [CB]
 Photii Lexicon ed. R. Porson. 2 vols. Leipzig 1823
- Plinius N.H. *Pline l'Ancien Histoire Naturelle Livre XXXIV* ed. H. Le Bonniec. Paris 1953 [CB]
- Plu. Arist. *Aristides: Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* ed. Cl. Lindskog et K. Ziegler. Leipzig. Vol. 1.1 1957 [BT]
- Demetr.* *Demetrius: —*Vol. 3.1 1971 [BT]
- Dem.* *Demosthenes: —*Vol. 1.2 1959 [BT]
- Lyc.* *Lycurgus: —*Vol. 3.2 1973 [BT]
- Phoc.* *Phocion: —*Vol. 2.1 1964 [BT]
- Sol.* *Solon: —*Vol. 1.1 1957 [BT]
- Thes.* *Theseus: —*Vol. 1.1 1957 [BT]
- De adul. et amic.* *Quomodo Adulator ab Amico Internoscatur: Plutarchi Moralia: —*Vol. 1 edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
- De tu. san.* *De tuenda sanitate praecepta: —*Vol. 1 edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
- Reg. et imp. apophth.* *Regum et Imperatorum Apophthegmata: —*Vol. 2 edd. W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, J.B. Titchener. Leipzig 1935 [BT]
- De Exil.* *De Exilio: —*Vol. 3 edd. W.R. Paton, M. Pohlens, W. Sieveking. Leipzig 1929 [BT]
- De glor. Ath.* *De Gloria Atheniensium: —*Vol. 2. edd. W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, J.B. Titchener. Leipzig 1935 [BT]
- Praec. ger. rep.* *Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae: —*Vol. 5.1 ed. C. Hubert. Leipzig 1957 [BT]
- Fragmenta* *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* ed. G.N. Bernardakis. Vol. 7 *Plutarchi fragmenta* Leipzig 1896 [BT]
 Plutarchi Moralia ed. F.H. Sandbach. Vol. 7. Leipzig 1967 [BT]
- [Plu.] *Cons. ad Apol.* *Consolatio ad Apollonium: —*Vol. 1 edd. W.R. Paton, Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
- Vitae X or.* *Vitae Decem Oratorum: —*Vol. 5.2 part 1 ed. J. Mau. Leipzig 1971 [BT]
- Poll. *Pollucis Onomasticon* ed. E. Bethe. Vol. 2 *Lib. VI–X*. Stuttgart 1967 (1931) [LG 9]
- Polyaenus *Polyaeni Strategematon Libri Octo* edd. E. Woelfflin, J. Melber. Leipzig 1887 [BT]
- Exc. Polyaen.* *Excerpta Polyaeni: Polyaeni Strategematon Libri Octo* edd. E. Woelfflin, J. Melber. Leipzig 1887 [BT]
- Plb. *Polybii Historiae* ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst. Vols. 3, 4. Leipzig 1893. 1904 [BT]

Pos.	<i>Posidonius. I The Fragments</i> edd. L. Edelstein, I.G. Kidd. Cambridge ² 1989 (1972)
Quint. <i>Inst.</i>	<i>M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Libri Duodecim</i> ed. M. Winterbottom. 2 vols. Oxford 1970 [OCT]
Rutilius Lupus	<i>P. Rutilii Lupi De Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis</i> ed. E. Brooks, Jr. Leiden 1970
Scholia in <i>Aristophanem</i>	<i>Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem</i> ed. Fr. Dübner. Paris 1877 <i>Scholia Vetera et Recentiora in Aristophanis Vespas</i> ed. W.J.W. Koster. Groningen 1978 [= SA 2.1]
<i>Homeri Iliadem</i>	<i>Scholia Graeca in Iliadem</i> ed. J. Lascaris [<i>Didymus Homeri interpretes pervetustus</i>]. Rome 1517 <i>Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem</i> ed. W. Dindorf. Vol.1. Oxford 1875 <i>Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem</i> ed. H. Erbse. Vol. 2 (E–I). Vol. 3 (K–Ξ). Vol. 4 (O–T). Berlin 1971. 1974 . 1975
<i>Homeri Odysseam</i>	<i>Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam</i> ed. W. Dindorf. 2 vols. Oxford 1855
<i>Platonem</i>	<i>Scholia Platonica</i> ed. W.C. Greene. Cambridge Mass. 1938
Seleucus	M. Müller, <i>De Seleuco Homérico</i> . Diss. Göttingen 1891
Socrates	<i>Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae</i> ed. G. Giannantoni. Vol. I. Naples 1990 [SSR]
Sosicrates Rhodius	R. Giannattasio Andria, <i>I frammenti delle «Successioni dei filosofi»</i> . Naples 989
Solon	ΣΟΛΩΝΟΣ ΝΟΜΟΙ. <i>Die Fragmente des Solonischen Gesetzeswerkes mit einer Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte</i> ed. E. Ruschenbusch. Wiesbaden 1966 <i>Solon. Testimonia veterum</i> ed. A. Martina. Rome 1968
Sotion	<i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> ed. F. Wehrli. Suppl. II <i>Sotion</i> . Basel/Stuttgart 1978
Stephanus Byzantius	<i>Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum Quae supersunt</i> ed. A. Meineke. Vol. 1. Berlin 1849
Stob. <i>Anth.</i>	<i>Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium</i> ed. C. Wachsmuth et O. Hense. Vols. 3–4. ed. O. Hense. Berlin 1894. 1909
Strabo	<i>Strabon Géographie</i> . Vol. 2 <i>Livres III et IV</i> ed. F. Lasserre. Paris 1966 [CB] —Vol. 6 <i>Livre IX</i> ed. R. Baladié. Paris 1996 [CB]
Suda	<i>Suidae Lexicon</i> ed. A. Adler. Vols. 1 (A–E), 2 (Δ–Θ), 3 (K–O; Ω), 4 (Π–Ψ). Leipzig 1928. 1931. 1933. 1935 [LG 1]
Synopsis Chronice Tabula Rhodiensis	ΣΥΝΟΨΙΣ ΧΡΟΝΙΚΗ ed. C. Sathas. Paris 1894 [BGMA 7] M. Segre, ‘Epigraphica: I. Catalogo di libri da Rodi,’ <i>RFIC</i> 63 (N.S. 13) (1935) 214–22
Teles	<i>Teletis Reliquiae</i> ed. O. Hense. Tübingen ² 1909
Tertullianus	<i>Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticum</i> ed. E. Dekkers. Turnhout 1954 [CC 1]
Themistius	<i>Themistii Orationes Quae Supersunt</i> edd. G. Downey, A.F. Norman. Vol. 2. Leipzig 1971 [BT]

Theodor.	<i>Diagorae Melii et Theodori Cyrenaei Reliquiae</i> ed. M. Winiarczyk. Leipzig 1981
Theodosius	<i>Theodosii Meliteni qui fertur Chronographia</i> ed. Th.L.F. Tafel. München 1859
Theon	C. Guhl, <i>Die Fragmente des Alexandrinischen Grammatikers Theon</i> . Diss. Hamburg 1969
Theon Prog.	<i>Aelius Théon. Progymnasmata</i> ed. M. Patillon. Paris 1997 [CB]
Thrasyllus	H. Tarrant, <i>Thrasyllan Platonism</i> . Ithaca and London 1993
Tzetzes <i>Historiae</i>	<i>Ioannis Tzetzae historiae</i> ed. P.A.M. Leone. Naples 1968
<i>Epistulae</i>	<i>Ioannis Tzetzae Epistulae</i> ed. P.A.M. Leone. Leipzig 1972 [BT]
<i>Comoedia</i>	<i>Prolegomena de Comoedia</i> ed. W.J.W. Koster. Groningen 1975 [SA 1.1A]
<i>Scholia in Lycoph.</i>	<i>Lycophronis Alexandra</i> ed. E. Scheer. Vol. 2 <i>Scholia continens</i> . Berlin ² 1958 (1908)
Victorinus	<i>Marii Victorini Ars Grammatica. Introduzione, Testo critico e Commento</i> ed. I. Mariotti. Firenze 1967
Vita Aeschinis	<i>Scholia in Aeschinem</i> ed. M.R. Dilts. Stuttgart/Leipzig 1992 [BT]
Vita Isocratis	<i>Isocrate Discours</i> ed. G. Mathieu et E. Brémond. Vol. 1. Paris 1928 [CB]
Vitruvius	<i>Vitruve De l'Architecture Livre VII</i> ed. B. Liou et M. Zuinghedau. Paris 1995 [CB]
Xenocrates	<i>Senocrate - Ermodoro. Frammenti</i> ed. M. Isnardi Parente. Naples 1982
Zonaras	<i>Ioannis Zonarae Epitome Historiarum</i> ed. L. Dindorf. Vol. 1. Leipzig 1868 [BT]

(c) Other abbreviations

a.	anno
aCn	ante Christum natum
ad loc.	ad locum
ap.	apud
app.	apparatus
cf.	confer
coll.	collato
Ep.	Epoche
explic.	explicavit
F	Fragmentum
fin.	fine
in.	initio
seclus.	seclusit
l.	linea/line
mg.	(in) margine
n.	note
no.	number
p.	pagina

pCn	post Christum natum
saec.	saeculo
schol.	scholium
s.v.	sub voce
T	Testimonium
v.	vide
*	not in Wehrli

(d) Symbols used in the apparatus

<α>	littera addenda/suppleta
[α]	littera spuria, eliminanda
†... vel †...†	locus nondum sanatus
α	littera in titulo vel papyro incerta
[α]	littera in titulo vel papyro non servata et coniectura suppleta
`α’	littera in papyro supra lineam addita

I. VITA

Demetrii Phalerii Vitae Antiquae

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 5.75–83 (OCT 1.236.20–241.2 Long)

[ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ]

- 2 W 75 Δημήτριος Φανοστράτου Φαληρεύς. οὗτος ἤκουσε μὲν
 24 W Θεοφράστου· δημηγορῶν δὲ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις τῆς πόλεως
 ἐξηγήσατο ἔτη δέκα, καὶ εἰκόνων ἡξιώθη χαλκῶν ἐξή-
 κοντα πρὸς ταῖς τριακοσίαις, ὧν αἱ πλείους ἐφ' ἵππων 5
 ἦσαν καὶ ἀρμάτων καὶ συνωρίδων, συντελεσθεῖσαι ἐν
 6 W οὐδὲ τριακοσίαις ἡμέραις· τοσοῦτον ἐσπουδάσθη. ἄρ-
 ξασθαι δ' αὐτὸν τῆς πολιτείας φησὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Μάγνης
 ἐν τοῖς Ὀμωνύμοις, ὅποτε φυγὼν Ἀλέξανδρον εἰς
 28 W Ἀθήνας ἦκεν Ἄρπαλος. πολλὰ δὲ καὶ κάλλιστα τῇ πατ- 10
 ρίδι ἐπολιτεύσατο. καὶ γὰρ προσόδοις καὶ κατασκευαῖς
 2 W 76 ἠύξησε τὴν πόλιν, καίπερ οὐκ εὐγενὴς ὢν. ἦν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς
 38 W Κόνωνος οἰκίας, ὡς Φαβωρίνος ἐν πρώτῳ τῶν Ἀπομνη-
 μονευμάτων φησὶν, ἀλλ' ἀστῇ καὶ εὐγενεῖ συνώκει 15
 Λαμία τῇ ἐρωμένη, καθάπερ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ φησὶν·
 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ Κλέωνος πεπονθέναι ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ ἱστο-
 ρεῖ. Δίδυμος δ' ἐν Συμποσιακοῖς καὶ Χαριτοβλέφαρον
 καὶ Λαμπιτῶ καλεῖσθαι αὐτὸν φησιν ἀπὸ τινος ἐταίρας.
 68 W λέγεται δ' ἀποβαλόντα αὐτὸν τὰς ὄψεις ἐν Ἀλεξαν-
 100/200 W δρεΐα, κομίσασθαι αὐθις παρὰ τοῦ Σαράπιδος· ὅθεν καὶ 20
 τοὺς παιᾶνας ποιῆσαι τοὺς μέχρι νῦν ᾄδομένους.
 52 W σφόδρα δὲ λαμπρὸς ὢν παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ὅμως

2–5 228 T 1 FGrH 2 Φανοστράτου] cf. 2.1; 16B.3; 17.8; Ars.
 188.18 Walz app. 38.1–6; 152.2 2–3 ἤκουσε μὲν Θεοφράστου]
 Thphr. no. 18.5 FHS&G 3 δημηγορῶν] cf. 62; 121.3–4; 131B.1–
 3 4 ἔτη δέκα] cf. 19.5; 30.25; 23A et 26 7–27 228 T 1 FGrH
 7–10 Demetr. Magn. F 16 Mejer 12–14 Favorin. F 37 Barigazzi
 12–14 Favorin. F 6 Mensching 14–15 Favorin. F 7 Mensching
 16–17 Favorin. F 11 Mensching = F 41 Barigazzi || ὑπὸ Κλέωνος
 πεπονθέναι] cf. 78; 2.7–8 17–18 Did. F 5 Schmidt p. 374 19–21
 228 T 6d FGrH 20 κομίσασθαι—Σαράπιδος] cf. 86.8 22–5
 σφόδρα—ᾠφλεν] = Suda φ 510 (LG 1.4.743.6–8 Adler), omisso
 ἐπιβουλευθεῖς 22–4 ὅμως—φθόνου] cf. 2.9–10; 19.13–14; 40.3 →

I. LIFE

Ancient Biographies of Demetrius of Phalerum

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.75–83 (OCT 1.236.20–241.2 Long)

[DEMETRIUS]

- 75 Demetrius, son of Phanostratus, of the deme Phalerum. He attended the lectures of Theophrastus. Through public speeches before the Athenians, he led the city for ten years and was awarded three hundred sixty bronze statues. Of these the majority portrayed him on horseback, on a chariot or driving a pair of horses. (The statues) were finished in less than three hundred days; so highly was he regarded. Demetrius of Magnesia in his *Namesakes* says that he entered politics at the time when Harpalus, fleeing Alexander, came to Athens.¹ Through his political activity he achieved for his fatherland much that was splendid: he added to the city both income and buildings, even though he was not well-born. For he was from the house of Conon, as Favorinus says in the first book of his *Memoirs*, but lived with a well-born fellow-citizen, Lamia, as her lover, as the same author says in the first book. But he also recounts in the second book that (Demetrius) was abused by Cleon; and Didymus in his *Table-talk* says that he was called “Gracelid” and “Radiant” after some courtesan. He is said to have lost his eyesight in Alexandria and to have retrieved it from Sarapis, which is how he came to compose those paeans which are still sung to this day.

Although he was quite illustrious among the Athenians, he too

conspectus siglorum:

B cod. Neapolitanus Bourbonicus gr. III B 29 (s. XII)

P cod. Parisinus gr. 1759 (s. XIII ex.)

F cod. Laurentianus 69.13 (s. XIII in.)

PX corrector cod. P, qui agnosci non potest

Ω consensus codd. BPF = hyparchetypon

Φ epitome Laertii Diogenis in cod. Vaticano gr. 96 (s. XII in.) servata

X consensus Ω et Φ = archetypon

1 tit. om. Ω 3 δημαγωγῶν Jacoby coll. Suda δ 429 19 ἀποβαλόντα BPΦ: τυφλωθέντα F 20 παρὰ BP: ἀπὸ F 21 μέχρι BP: μέχρι τοῦ F

- 52 W 77 ἐπεσκοτήθη καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ τὰ πάντα διεσθίοντος
φθόνου. ἐπιβουλευθεῖς γὰρ ὑπό τινων δίκην θανάτου οὐ
παρῶν ὥφλεν. οὐ μὴν ἐκυρίευσαν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, 25
ἀλλὰ τὸν ἰὸν ἀπήρυγον εἰς τὸν χαλκόν, κατασπάσαντες
αὐτοῦ τὰς εἰκόνας καὶ τὰς μὲν ἀποδόμενοι, τὰς δὲ βυ-
θίσαντες, τὰς δὲ κατακόψαντες εἰς ἀμίδας· λέγεται γὰρ
καὶ τοῦτο. μία δὲ μόνη σώζεται ἐν ἀκροπόλει. Φαβωρ-
ῖνος δέ φησιν ἐν Παντοδαπῇ ἱστορίᾳ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι τοὺς 30
Ἀθηναίους Δημητρίου κελεύσαντος τοῦ βασιλέως.
ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἔτει τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ ἐπέγραψαν ἀνομίας,
ὡς Φαβωρίνος.
- 69 W 78 φησὶ δ' αὐτὸν Ἑρμιππος μετὰ τὸν Κασάνδρου θάν-
ατον φοβηθέντα Ἀντίγονον παρὰ Πτολεμαῖον ἐλθεῖν 35
τὸν Σωτῆρα· κάκεῖ χρόνον ἱκανὸν διατρίβοντα συμ-
βουλεύειν τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ τὴν
βασιλείαν τοῖς ἐξ Εὐρυδίκης περιθεῖναι παισί. τοῦ δὲ οὐ
πεισθέντος ἀλλὰ παραδόντος τὸ διάδημα τῷ ἐκ Βερε-
νίκης, μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνου τελευτὴν ἀξιωθῆναι πρὸς 40
τούτου παραφυλάττεσθαι ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ μέχρι τι δόξει περὶ
αὐτοῦ. ἐνταῦθα ἀθυμότερον διῆγε· καὶ πῶς ὑπνώττων
ὑπ' ἀσπίδος τὴν χεῖρα δηχθεὶς τὸν βίον μεθῆκε. καὶ
τέθαιπται ἐν τῷ Βουσιρίτῃ νομῷ πλησίον Διοσπόλεως.
- 79 καὶ αὐτῷ ἐπεγράψαμεν ἡμεῖς [παρ' ἡμῖν]· 45
ἀνεῖλεν ἀσπίς τὸν σοφὸν Δημήτριον
ἰὸν ἔχουσα πολὺν
ἄσμηκτον, οὐ στίλβουσα φῶς ἀπ' ὀμμάτων
ἀλλ' αἶδην μέλανα.
- 69 W Ἡρακλείδης δ' ἐν τῇ ἐπιτομῇ τῶν Σωτίωνος Δια- 50
δοχῶν τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ τὴν βασιλείαν θέλειν ἐκχωρῆσαι
τὸν Πτολεμαῖον· τὸν δ' ἀποτρέπειν φάσκοντα, “ἂν ἄλλῳ
57 W δῶς, σὺ οὐχ ἔξεις.” ὁπηνίκα δ' ἐσυκοφαντεῖτο ἐν ταῖς
Ἀθήναις—μανθάνω γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο—Μένανδρος ὁ
κωμικὸς παρ' ὀλίγον ἦλθε κριθῆναι δι' οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ὅτι 55

24–5 ἐπιβουλευθεῖς—ὥφλεν] cf. 23E.8; 31.7–11 29–54 228 T 1
FGrH 29–33 Favorin. F 70 Barigazzi 29–31 Favorin. F 38
Menschling 32–3 Favorin. F 54 Menschling 34–44 Hermipp. F
58 Wehrli 45–9 AP VII 113 50–3 Heraclid. Lemb. F 10 FHG III
170 = Sotion F 18 Wehrli 53–7 Men. T 8 Koerte 54–6 μανθάνω—
αὐτῷ] = Suda μ 155 (LG 1.3.320.2–3 Adler)

77 came under the shadow of all-devouring envy. Impeached by certain people he was sentenced to death while being absent. They did not, however, get hold of him in person but spitted out their venom on the bronze (portraits): they tore down his likenesses, sold some, threw others into the sea and cut still others into pieces in order to make chamber-pots of them; for this too is related. Only one statue is preserved on the Acropolis. Favorinus in his *Varied Inquiry* says that the Athenians did this at the order of King Demetrius. But according to Favorinus, they also registered the year in which he was archon as (the year) of 'lawlessness'.

78 Hermippus says that after the death of Cassander, fearing Antigonus, he went to Ptolemy the Saviour, and that staying there quite a while he advised Ptolemy, among other things, to bestow the kingship on his children by Eurydice. He (Ptolemy) remained unpersuaded and handed his diadem on to his son by Berenice; (then) after the king's death this son thought fit to have Demetrius guarded in the country pending a judgment about him. There he lived in considerable despondency, and somehow while sleeping he was bitten in the hand by an asp and died. He is buried in the district of Busiris near Diospolis.²

79 For him too I have composed an epigram:

An asp took the life of the wise Demetrius,
one with much venom
lacking a purge; whose eyes did not gleam with light
but with black death.

Heraclides in his epitome of Sotion's *Successions* (says) that Ptolemy was minded to leave his kingdom to Philadelphus, but (Demetrius) tried to dissuade (him) saying "If you give (it) to another, you will not have (it)." At a time when he was being sued in Athens—for this too has come to my notice—the comic poet Menander was almost brought to trial for no other reason than that

23 διεσθίωντος *BP*: κατεσθίωντος *F* 32 τῷ ἔτει *P^xγρ*; τὸ ἐπὶ *BP*: τῷ ἔπει *F*
43 μεθῆκε *Kuehn*: μετέθηκε *X* 45 παρ' ἡμῖν *del. Scaliger* 54 τοῦτο *Ω*: τοῦτο
ὅτι *Suda* μ 155

*

	φίλος ἦν αὐτῷ. ἀλλ' αὐτὸν παρητήσατο Τελεσφόρος ὁ ἀνεψιὸς τοῦ Δημητρίου.	
74 W 80	πλήθει δὲ βιβλίων καὶ ἀριθμῷ στίχων σχεδὸν ἅπ- αντας παρελήλακε τοὺς κατ' αὐτὸν περιπατητικούς,	
189 W	εὐπαίδευτος ὢν καὶ πολὺπείρος παρ' ὄντινοῦν· ὢν ἔστι 60 τὰ μὲν ἱστορικά, τὰ δὲ πολιτικά, τὰ δὲ περὶ ποιητῶν, τὰ δὲ ῥητορικά, δημηγοριῶν τε καὶ πρεσβειῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ λόγων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγὰ καὶ ἄλλα πλείω. ἔστι δὲ τὰ	
112 W		
139-47 W	Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας α' β' γ' δ' ε',	65
139-47 W	Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι πολιτειῶν α' β',	
129 W	Περὶ δημαγωγίας α' β',	
126 W	Περὶ πολιτικῆς α', β',	
127 W	Περὶ νόμων α',	
156-73 W	Περὶ ῥητορικῆς α' β',	70
123-4 W	Στρατηγικῶν α' β',	
190-3 W 81	Περὶ Ἰλιάδος α' β',	
190-3 W	Περὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας α' β' γ' δ',	
108 W	Πτολεμαῖος α',	
85 W	Ἐρωτικὸς α',	75
109 W	Φαιδώνδας α',	
107 W	Μαίδων α',	
106 W	Κλέων α',	
91-8 W	Σωκράτης α',	
104 W	Ἀρτοξέρξης α',	80
190-3 W	Ὀμηρικὸς α',	
102 W	Ἀριστείδης α',	
103 W	Ἀριστόμαχος α',	
77 W	Προτρεπτικὸς α',	
131-8 W	Ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτείας α',	85
131-8 W	Περὶ τῆς δεκαετίας α',	
148 W	Περὶ τῶν Ἰώνων α',	

58-110 228 *T 1 FG rH* 58-64 *Aesopica T 74 Perry* 58-9
πλήθει—περιπατητικούς] *cf.* 2.3; 6; 19.11-13 60 εὐπαίδευτος—
ὄντινοῦν] *cf.* 56.8; 62.6; 63.10-11; 64.6-7 60-4 *cf.* 2.3-4 *et v.* 80,
81, 88, 118, 149, 150 65-9 *v.* 88 70 *v.* 118 71 *v.* 88 72-
3 *v.* 118 74 *v.* 150 75. *v.* 81 76 *v.* 88 77 *v.* 150 78- →

he was a friend of him (Demetrius). But Demetrius' cousin Telesphorus got him off.

- 80 In quantity of books and number of lines he surpassed almost all the members of the Peripatos of his day; he was well-educated and widely experienced beyond anyone. Of these (books) some are historical, some political, some on poets and some rhetorical; there are collections (not only) of public speeches and embassy addresses, but also of Aesopic fables and much more. They are:

On Legislation in Athens, 5 books
On Constitutions in Athens, 2 books
On Leadership of the people, 2 books
On (the Art of) Politics, 2 books
On Laws, 1 book
On (the Art of) Rhetoric, 2 books
Matters of Strategy, 2 books
81 *On the Iliad*, 2 books
On the Odyssey, 4 books
Ptolemy, 1 book
(Dialogue) on Love, 1 book
Phaedondas, 1 book
Maedon, 1 book
Cleon, 1 book
Socrates, 1 book
Artoxerxes, 1 book
(Dialogue) on Homer, 1 book
Aristides, 1 book
Aristomachus, 1 book
Exhortation, 1 book
In Defence of the Constitution, 1 book
On the Ten Years, 1 book
On the Ionians, 1 book

9 v. 88 80 v. 150 81 v. 118 82–3 v. 88 84 v. 81 85–6 v. 88 87 v. 150

58 ἀριθμῶ FP^x: -ῶν PB² (om. B) 66 πολιτεῶν F: -τῶν BP 68 πολιτικῆς BP: -κῶν F 73 α'β'γ'δ'ε' P^x 77 Μαίδων BP: μέδων F: †Μαίδων Jacoby: Μέδων Herwig: Μίδων Hirzel (cf. 3.62) 80 ante 'Ἀρτοξέρξης α' add. 'Ἀριστόμαχος α' BP (sed cf. 83)

174–86 W	Πρεσβευτικὸς α΄,	
87 W	Περὶ πίστεως α΄,	
88 W	Περὶ χάριτος α΄,	90
79–81 W	Περὶ τύχης α΄,	
78 W	Περὶ μεγαλοψυχίας α΄,	
86 W	Περὶ γάμου α΄,	
187 W	Περὶ τοῦ δοκοῦ α΄,	
89 W	Περὶ εἰρήνης α΄,	95
127 W	Περὶ νόμων α΄,	
90 W	Περὶ ἐπιτηδευμάτων α΄,	
84 W	Περὶ καιροῦ α΄,	
105 W	Διονύσιος α΄,	
111 W	Χαλκιδικὸς α΄,	100
131–8 W	Ἀθηναίων καταδρομὴ α΄,	
194 W	Περὶ Ἀντιφάνους α΄,	
130 W	Προοίμιον ἱστορικὸν α΄,	
197 W	Ἐπιστολαὶ α΄,	
128 W	Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἔνορκος α΄,	105
82–3 W	Περὶ γήρως α΄,	
125 W	Δίκαια α΄,	
112 W	Αἰσωπείων α΄,	
113 W	Χρειῶν α΄,	

181 W	82	χαρακτὴρ δὲ φιλόσοφος, εὐτονία ῥητορικῇ καὶ	110
122 W		δυνάμει κεκραμένος. οὗτος ἀκούσας ὅτι τὰς εἰκόνας	
		αὐτοῦ κατέστρεψαν Ἀθηναῖοι, “ἀλλ’ οὐ τὴν ἀρετὴν,”	
115 W		ἔφη, “δι’ ἣν ἐκείνας ἀνέστησαν.” ἔλεγε μὴ μικρὸν εἶναι	
		μέρος τὰς ὀφρῦς· ὅλῳ γοῦν ἐπισκοτῆσαι τῷ βίῳ δύν-	
80/121 W		ασθαι. οὐ μόνον τὸν πλοῦτον ἔφη τυφλόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν	115
120/160 W		ὁδηγοῦσαν αὐτὸν τύχην. ὅσον ἐν πολέμῳ δύνασθαι	
118 W		σίδηρον, τοσοῦτον ἐν πολιτείαις ἰσχύειν λόγον. ἰδὼν	
		ποτε νεανίσκον ἄσωτον, “ἰδού,” ἔφη, “τετράγωνος Ἑρ-	
119 W		μῆς ἔχων σύρμα, κοιλίαν, αἰδοῖον, πώγωνα.” τῶν τετυ-	

88–9 v. 118 90–2 v. 81 93 v. 88 94 v. 150 95–6 v. 88 97
v. 81 98 v. 88 99–100 v. 150 101 v. 88 102 v. 118 103
v. 150 104 v. 149 105 v. 88 106–7 v. 81 108 v. 118;
Aesopica T 74 Perry 109 v. 81 111–19 = *Ars. 187.7–18 Walz*
111–13 *idem apophthegma Aristidi attribuitur in Gnom. Vat. 743, no.48*
(23.19–20 *Sternbach*) 119–23 = *Ars. 188.11–15 Walz* →

Ambassadorial Address, 1 book
On Proof (or On Trust), 1 book
On Kindness (or Grace), 1 book
On Fortune, 1 book
On Greatness of Soul, 1 book
On Marriage, 1 book
On the Beam <in the Sky>, 1 book³
On Peace, 1 book
On Laws, 1 book
On Pursuits, 1 book
On the Right Moment, 1 book
Dionysius, 1 book
Chalcidian (Speech), 1 book
A Denunciation of the Athenians, 1 book
On Antiphanes, 1 book
An Historical Preface, 1 book
Letters, 1 book
The Sworn Assembly, 1 book
On Old Age, 1 book
Matters of Justice, 1 book
Aesopic Fables, 1 book
Practical Maxims, 1 book

- 82 His style is philosophical with an admixture of rhetorical vigor and force. On hearing that the Athenians had taken down his statues, he said, "But not the merit on account of which they erected these." He said that the eyebrows are no small part (of the face): they can cast a shadow over the whole of one's life. He said that not only wealth is blind, but also the fortune that tells it where to go. That speech has as much force in political affairs as iron has in war. Once when he saw a profligate young man he said, "Look, a four-square herm (complete) with tail, belly, member and beard."

88 πρεσβευτικὸς *edd.*: πρεσβυτ- Ω 94 δοκοῦ Ω: δόκου = δοκήσεως *Menagius*
104 ἐπιστολαὶ *BP*: -λή *F* 105 Ἐκκλησία ἔνορκος α' *DG*: ἐκκληθένορχα *B*:
ἐκκληθενόρχ(ος) α' *P*: ἐκκλησία ἔνορχος *FP*⁴ 110-11 ῥητορικῇ καὶ δυνάμει
κεκραμένος *D*: ῥητορικῇ δυνάμει κεκραμένος *BP*: ῥητορικῇ δυνάμει τε
πεπυκνωμένος *F* 113 μὴ μικρὸν Ω 117 πολιτείαις *BP*: πολίταις *F*: πο-
λιτεία Φ || λόγον *PF* Φ: δῶρον *B* 119 σύρμα] στόμα *Reiske*; cf. *Stob.* 3.4.66:
στῦμα *Robertson delete* αἰδοῖον || κοιλίαν] κωλῆν *Wachsmuth delete* αἰδοῖον

117 W φωμένων ἀνδρῶν ἔφη τὸ μὲν ὕψος δεῖν περιαιρεῖν, τὸ δὲ 120
οἰκίας τοὺς γονέας αἰδεῖσθαι, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὁδοῖς τοὺς
116 W 83 ἀπαντῶντας, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἐρημίαις ἑαυτούς. τοὺς φίλους
ἐπὶ μὲν τὰ ἀγαθὰ παρακαλουμένους ἀπιέναι, ἐπὶ δὲ τὰς
συμφορὰς αὐτομάτους. τοσαῦτα καὶ εἰς τοῦτον ἀνα- 125
φέρεσθαι δοκεῖ.

121–3 τοὺς–ἑαυτούς] cf. 72 123–5 = *Ars.* 187.19–20 Walz; cf.
143.19–22 126 *sequitur tabula homonymorum* (OCT 1.241.3–242.4
Long), in qua noster secundus nominatur (= *Demetr. Magn. F* 17 Mejer)

121 καταλείπειν FΦ: καταλιπεῖν BP 122 γονέας BFΦ: γονεῖς P
124 ἀπιέναι Ω: ἰέναι Φ

2 Suda s.v. Δημήτριος (no. 429, LG 1.2.40.21–41.2 Adler)

3 W Δημήτριος, Φανοστράτου, Φαληρεύς (Φάληρον δὲ
75 W λιμὴν τῆς Ἀττικῆς), ὃς τὸ πρῶτον Φανὸς ἐκαλεῖτο·
φιλόσοφος Περιπατητικός. γέγραφε φιλόσοφά τε καὶ
ἱστορικὰ καὶ ῥητορικὰ καὶ πολιτικὰ καὶ περὶ ποιητῶν.
ἠκροάσατο δὲ Θεοφράστου καὶ δημαγωγὸς Ἀθήνησι 5
36 W γέγονε. συνέγραψε δὲ συχνὰ βιβλία. οὕτως ἦν δὲ σφόδρα
εὐπρεπὴς ὥς καὶ διαβολὴν λαβεῖν, ὅτι γέγονεν ἐρώμενος
Νέωνος, καὶ προσαγορευθῆναι ὑπὸ τινων αὐτὸν Λαμ-
70 W πετῶ καὶ Χαριτοβλέφαρον. εἰς μέγα δὲ ἀρθεῖς δόξης καὶ
ἐπικρατείας ὑπὸ τοῦ φθόνου κατεστρατηγήθη καὶ 10
ἐξελαθεῖς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἦλθε καὶ παρὰ τῷ
Σωτῆρι Πτολεμαίῳ διατρίβων δηχθεὶς ὑπὸ ἀσπίδος
ἀπέθανε καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν τῷ Βουσιρίτῃ νομῷ, πλησίον
Διοσπόλεως τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἔλεσι.

1–14 228 T 1 FGrH 3 φιλόσοφος Περιπατητικός] cf. 1.58–9; 36.12–
13; 40.1 5 ἠκροάσατο–Θεοφράστου] *Thphr. no.* 18.5 FHS&G ||
δημαγωγὸς] cf. 1.3; 62 6–9 οὕτως–Χαριτοβλέφαρος] cf. *Ps.-Hsch.*
Mil. 19 (BT 15.18–20 Flach) 7–8 γέγονεν–Νέωνος] cf. 1.16 ||
Λαμπετῶ] cf. 1.18; 5.2 quae in Suda post ἔλεσι sequuntur (41.2–
10 Adler) ad Demetrium Poliorcetam spectant et derivata sunt ex D.S.
19.81.3–4 (BT 5.130.5–16 Fischer) = *Exc. Const. De virt. et vit.* 173
(2.1.249.12–21 Büttner-Wobst); in *Excerptis falso* ὁ Δημήτριος ὁ
Φαληρεὺς nominatur →

Of puffed-up men he said that one should cut down their height and leave their pride alone. He said that it is fitting for the young when at home to treat their parents respectfully, in the street those
83 they meet, and in solitary places themselves. That friends set out to (share) good times upon invitation, but to (share) calamities of their own accord. All these (sayings) seem to be attributed to him as well.⁴

¹ I.e., in 326/5; cp. D.S. 17.108.4–8; Ath. 13.67 594D–E.

² I.e., ‘Zeus’ Town’.

³ If the conjecture of Ménage is adopted, the title would be *On Opinion*.

⁴ The remainder of the *Life* has been omitted. It is a list of twenty persons who share the name ‘Demetrius’ (*OCT* 1.241.3–242.4 Long). Demetrius of Phalerum is listed second. The third is also a Peripatetic: Demetrius of Byzantium.

2 *Suda*, under *Demetrius* (no. 429, *LG* 1.2.40.21–41.2 Adler)

Demetrius, son of Phanostratus, of Phalerum (a harbour in Attica), who at first was called Phanus;¹ a Peripatetic philosopher. He has written works of philosophy, history, rhetoric, politics, and on poets. He attended the lectures of Theophrastus and became a leader of the people at Athens. He composed a great number of books. He was so exceedingly good-looking that he was even slanderously said to have been the beloved of Neon,² and he was addressed by some as ‘Radiant’ and ‘Gracelid’. Elevated to a great height of fame and power, he was brought down by the stratagems of envy. Expelled by the Athenians, he went to Egypt; and while living at the court of Ptolemy the Saviour, he was bitten by an asp and died. He was buried in the district of Busiris near Diospolis³ in the marshes.⁴

¹ This clause refers to Demetrius, not to Phanostratus.

² This person is the same as the Cleon mentioned in D.L. 5.76 (= 1.16), but his identity is unknown.

³ I.e., ‘Zeus’ Town’.

⁴ The remainder of the entry does not concern Demetrius of Phalerum but Demetrius Poliorcetes.

4 ῥητορικὰ] -κὴν V || πολιτικὰ] -κὴν V 8 Νέωνος] νέος ὧν I: Κλέωνος D.L.
8–9 Λαμπετὼ] Λαμπιτὼ D.L., Ath.

- 3 Asclepiades ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae* 13.21 567C–D (BT 3.250.22–4; 250.26–251.4 Kaibel)

40 W καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πολλά, ὦναιδές, δράματα ἀπὸ ἐταιρῶν
D ἔσχε τὰς ἐπιγραφάς, ... Εὐβούλου Κλεψύδρα. οὕτω δ'
ἐκλήθη αὕτη ἡ ἐταίρα, ἐπειδὴ πρὸς κλεψύδραν συνου-
σίαζεν ἕως κενωθῇ, ὡς Ἀσκληπιάδης εἶρηκεν ὁ τοῦ
Ἀρείου ἐν τῷ περὶ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως συγγράμ- 5
ματι, τὸ κύριον αὐτῆς ὄνομα φάσκων εἶναι Μητίχην.

1–6 *Asklepiades Areiu* 157 F 1 FGrH; *Eubulus* F 54 PCG K.-A.;
Eubulus F 54a Hunter

1 ἐταιρῶν *Musurus*: ἐτέρων A 4 κενωθείη *Meineke*

Vita Privata

Origo

- 4 Aelianus, *Varia historia* 12.43 (BT 143.14–18 Dilts)

2b W Φωκίων δὲ ὁ Χρηστὸς ἐπικληθεὶς πατρὸς μὲν δοί-
δυκας ἐργαζομένου ἦν, Δημήτριον δὲ τὸν Φαληρέα
οἰκότριβα γενέσθαι λέγουσιν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας τῆς Τιμοθέου
καὶ Κόνωνος.

1 *Plu. Phoc.* 4.1 2–4 Δημήτριον–Κόνωνος] cf. 1.12–13; *FGrH* II
b 642 ad 228 T 1

Forma

- 5 Diyllus ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae* 13.65 593E–F (BT 3.308.22–309.2 Kaibel)

37 W Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Φαληρεὺς Λαμπιτοῦς τῆς Σαμίας
ἐταίρας ἐρασθεὶς ἡδέως δι' αὐτὴν καὶ Λαμπιτὸν προση-
γορεύετο, ὥς φησι Δίυλλος· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Χαριτο-
F βλέφαρος...

1–4 *Diyllus* 73 F 4 FGrH; cf. *Did.* F 5 Schmidt p. 374; *Ath. Epit.*
(2.2.119.9 Peppink) *habet* ὅτι Λαμπιτὸν ἢ Δ. τοῦ Φ. ἐταίρα
Χαριτοβλέφαρος ἐκαλεῖτο; cf. 1.17–18; 2.8–9; 43A.24

de capite 65 v. Kaibel p. 308 2 δι' αὐτὴν *Jacobs*: δ' αὐτὴν (*notato* →

- 3 Asclepiades in Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.21 567C–D (BT 3.250.22–4; 250.26–251.4 Kaibel)

Many other dramas also got their title from courtesans, you D impudent one,¹ (such as) ... *Klepsydra* by Eubulus.² This last courtesan got this name, because she timed her sexual services on the waterclock (and made them last) until it had run out; Asclepiades, the son of Areius,³ said this in his monograph on Demetrius of Phalerum, saying that her real name was Metiche.

¹ The Cynic Cynulcus is addressing the grammarian Myrtilus.

² Poet of the Middle Comedy, c. 380–c. 335.

³ Nothing further is known about this Asclepiades. He may have been a contemporary of Demetrius (Jacoby *FGrH* II b 587).

Private Life

Parentage

- 4 Aelian, *Miscellaneous History* 12.43 (BT 143.14–18 Dilts)

Phocion, surnamed the Good, was (the son) of a father who made pestles, and they say that Demetrius of Phalerum was born as a slave of the house of Timotheus and of Conon.¹

¹ In 12.43 Aelian lists instances of men rising from humble origins to high positions, including a number of Persian kings and Macedonian rulers; then Themistocles, and after Phocion and Demetrius of Phalerum, Hyperbolus, Cleophon, Demades and a number of Spartans.

Outward Appearance

- 5 Diyllus in Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.65 593E–F (BT 3.308.22–309.2 Kaibel)

Demetrius of Phalerum fell in love with the Samian courtesan Lampito according to Diyllus, he was pleased to be called ‘Radi- F ant’ because of her. He was also called ‘Gracelid’ ...¹

¹ The epitomist understands the Greek text to mean that Lampito was called ‘Gracelid’.

mendo) A || Λαμπιτὸν] Λαμπιτὸν D.L.: Λαμπετὸν Suda 2–3 προσηγορεύετο Jacobs: προσηγόρευτο A 3 Δίυλλος] Δίδυμος Casaubon ex D.L.; cf. Jacoby *FGrH* II b 642 ad 228 T 1

Uxor

6 Diogenianus ap. Georgium Choeroboscum, *Orthographia*
(*An.Ox.* 2.239.13–15 Cramer)

39 W Λοίμια: ὄνομα κύριον, γέγονεν δὲ ἡ γυνὴ Δημητρίου
τοῦ Φαλήρεως· ἔστιν δὲ καὶ προσηγορικόν, τὰ χάσματα·
οὕτω Διογενιανός.

1 cf. *FGrH II b* 642 ad 228 T 1; 1.14–15; 5

de Himeraeo, Demetrii fratre, vide **13A–B**

Demetrius, Demetrii progenies

*7 Hegesander ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae* 4.64 167D–F
(BT 1.377.14–378.3 Kaibel)

E “εἰς τοσοῦτον δ’ ἀσωτίας ἐληλύθει καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ
Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως ἀπόγονος, ὥς φησιν Ἡγήσαν-
δρος, ὥστε Ἀρισταγόραν μὲν ἔχειν τὴν Κορινθίαν
ἐρωμένην, ζῆν δὲ πολυτελῶς. ἀνακαλεσαμένων δ’
αὐτὸν τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν καὶ κελευόντων βέλτιον ζῆν, 5
‘ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν,’ εἶπεν, ‘ἐλευθερίως ζῶ. καὶ γὰρ ἐταίραν
ἔχω τὴν καλλίστην καὶ ἀδικῶ οὐδένα καὶ πίνω Χῖον
οἶνον καὶ τᾶλλ’ ἀρκούντως παρασκευάζομαι, τῶν ἰδίων
μου προσόδων εἰς ταῦτα ἐκποιουσῶν, οὐ καθάπερ ὑμῶν
F ἔνιοι δεκαζόμενος ζῶ καὶ μοιχεύων.’ καὶ τῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα 10
πραττόντων καὶ ἐπ’ ὀνόματός τινος κατέλεξε. ταῦτα δ’
ἀκούσας Ἀντίγονος ὁ βασιλεὺς θεσμοθέτην αὐτὸν
κατέστησεν. τοῖς δὲ Παναθηναίοις ἵππαρχος ὢν ἰκρίον
ἔστησε πρὸς τοῖς Ἑρμαῖς Ἀρισταγόρα μετεωρότερον
τῶν Ἑρμῶν, Ἐλευσίνι τε μυστηρίων ὄντων ἔθηκεν αὐτῇ

Wife

- 6 Diogenianus in Georgius Choeroboscus, *Orthography* (*An.Ox.* 2.239.13–15 Cramer)

Loimia: proper name; she was the wife of Demetrius of Phalerum; it is also an appellative: gaping mouth. Thus Diogenianus.¹

¹ This is an entry in a list of orthographical problems. Loimia appears to be the same as the Lamia mentioned as the hetaera of Demetrius by Favorinus in D.L. 5.76 = 1.14–15.

on Himeraeus, brother of Demetrius, see **13A–B**

Demetrius, Grandson of Demetrius

- *7 Hegesander in Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 4.64 167D–F (*BT* 1.377.14–378.3 Kaibel)

“Demetrius too, the descendant of Demetrius of Phalerum,¹
 E went to such lengths in profligacy,” as Hegesander says, “as to keep Aristagora from Corinth as his lover, and live on a grand scale. When the members of the Court of the Areopagus summoned him and told him to lead a better life, he said, ‘But, as it is I am living in the style of a freeborn man. For as mistress I have the most beautiful woman, I do not harm anyone, I drink wine from Chius, and in other respects too I live within my means, my private income being quite enough for these things, without living, as some of you do, by letting myself be bribed and being an adul-
 F terer.’ And he in fact mentioned some who acted in such a way by name. When King Antigonus² heard this, he made him lawgiver. As Commander of the Cavalry during the Panathenaic Festival he raised for Aristagora near the Herms a platform higher than these Herms, and during the Eleusinian Mysteries he placed a throne

θρόνον παρὰ τὸ ἀνάκτορον, οἰμώξεσθαι φήσας τοὺς 15
κωλύσοντας.”

1–17 *Hegesand. F 8 FHG IV 415; Ath. Epit. (2.1.55.20–30 Peppink) [= EC]; breviter Eust. Od. 5.252 (1.213.1–3 Stallbaum)* 5 Ἀρεο-
παγιτῶν] cf. **153.22** 13–17 *Agora III no. 302*

4 ἐρωμένην] ἐταίραν *EC* 14 Ἀρισταγόρα] Ἀρισταγόρας *EC* 16
οἰμώξεσθαι *C*: οἰμώζεσθαι *AE*

Discipulus et socius Theophrasti & Commilitones

8 Loci in hoc volumine exscripti, in quibus Demetrius Phalereus vel discipulus vel auditor vel socius Theophrasti nominatur

- 1 Philodemus, *De Rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 453, fr. 4.10–13 = **131B.10–13**
- 2 Cicero, *De Legibus* 3.6.14 = **57.12–16**
- 3 Cicero, *Brutus* 9.37 = **121.4–6**
- 4 Cicero, *De Finibus* 5.19.54 = **36.10**
- 5 Cicero, *De Officiis* 1.1.3 = **119.10–11**
- 6 Strabo, *Geographica* 9.1.20 = **19.9–10**
- 7 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.75 = **1.1–2**
- 8 Suda s.v. Δημήτριος = **2.5**
et cf.
- 9 Plutarchus, *De tuenda sanitate praecepta* 24 135C = **67.4–5**
- 10 Ioannes Tzetzes, *Epistulae* 61 = **69.5–6**

cf. **9A–11** et Theophrastus no. 18.5 *FHS&G*

de Xenocrate Academico philosopho vide **49**

9A Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *De Dinarcho* 2.2 (CB 5.124.9–12 Aujac)

^{4 W} Δείναρχος ὁ ῥήτωρ υἱὸς μὲν ἦν Σωστράτου, Κορίνθιος δὲ τὸ γένος, ἀφικόμενος δὲ εἰς Ἀθήνας, καθ’ ὃν χρόνον ἦνθουν αἱ τε τῶν φιλοσόφων καὶ ῥητόρων διατριβαί, Θεοφράστῳ τε συνεγένετο καὶ Δημητρίῳ τῷ Φαληρεῖ.

1–4 *Dinarchus T I.1 (BT 1.1–5 Conomis); Thphr. no. 18.7 FHS&G*

for her next to the Holy of Holies, with the warning that anyone who tried to stop him would live to regret it.”

¹ Among a number of instances of profligate living, Athenaeus has Ulpian cite Demetrius, grandson of Demetrius of Phalerum; cp. **162**.

² Antigonus Gonatas, son of Demetrius Poliorcetes, who captured Athens in 262.

Student and Associate of Theophrastus & Fellow Students

8 Passages Printed in This Volume, in which Demetrius of Phalerum is Named as the Disciple or Pupil or Associate of Theophrastus

- 1 Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 453, fr. 4.10–13 = **131B**.10–13
- 2 Cicero, *On Laws* 3.6.14 = **57**.12–16
- 3 Cicero, *Brutus* 9.37 = **121**.4–6
- 4 Cicero, *On Ends* 5.19.54 = **36**.10
- 5 Cicero, *On Duties* 1.1.3 = **119**.10–11
- 6 Strabo, *Geography* 9.1.20 = **19**.9–10
- 7 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.75 = **1**.1–2
- 8 *Suda*, on *Demetrius* = **2**.5
and cp.
- 9 Plutarch, *Rules for Preserving Health* 24 135C = **67**.4–5
- 10 Johannes Tzetzes, *Letters* 61 = **69**.5–6

cp. **9A–11** and Theophrastus no. 18.5 FHS&G

on Xenocrates, philosopher of the Academy, see **49**

9A Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Dinarchus* 2.2 (CB 5.124.9–12 Aujac)

The orator Dinarchus was a son of Sostratus and a Corinthian by birth. Having arrived in Athens at the time when the schools of the philosophers and of the orators flourished, he fell in with Theophrastus and Demetrius of Phalerum.¹

¹ In *On Dinarchus* 4, Dionysius puts Dinarchus’ birth in 361/360, and the beginning of his career as a *logographos* in 336/5.

- 9B** [Plutarchus], *Vitae Decem Oratorum* 850B–C (BT 5.2.1. 43.11–17 Mau)

⁴W C Δείναρχος Σωκράτους ἢ Σωστράτου, ὥς μὲν τινες ἐγχώριος, ὥς δέ τισι δοκεῖ Κορίνθιος, ἀφικόμενος εἰς Ἀθήνας ἔτι νέος, καθ' ὃν χρόνον Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπήει τὴν Ἀσίαν, κατοικήσας αὐτόθι ἀκροατῆς μὲν ἐγένετο Θεοφράστου τοῦ διαδεξαμένου τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους δια- 5 τριβήν, ὠμίλησε δὲ καὶ Δημητρίῳ τῷ Φαληρεῖ.

1–6 *Din. T I.2* (BT 2.19–3.4 *Conomis*); *Caec. Cal. F 149 Ofenloch* (BT 128.1–7); *Thphr. no. 18.7 FHS&G*; *Phot. Bibl. 267 496b8–13* (CB 8.72.24–9 Henry)

3–4 ἐπήει τὴν Ἀσίαν] ἐπήει τ. Ἀ. *Ap^cE Xylander Ofenloch*: ἐπὶ τ. Ἀ. *αA^{ac}*: ἐπὶ τ. Ἀ. <ἐστρατεύετο> *Zucker Mau*, <διέβαινε> (<διέβη> *Reiske*) *Wytttenbach Conomis ex Phot.*

- 10** Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.39 (OCT 1.216.7–9 Long)

⁵W λέγεται δ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἴδιον κῆπον σχεῖν μετὰ τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους τελευτήν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως, ὃς ἦν καὶ γνώριμος αὐτῷ, τοῦτο συμπράξαντος.

1–3 *Thphr. no. 1.38–40 et no. 18.5 FHS&G*; cf. *FGrH II b 642 ad 228 T 1*

- 11** Themistius, *Orationes* 21 252b (BT 2.31.4–7 Downey-Norman)

⁴¹W ποίαν ἦνεγκας λαιδορίαν, οἴαν Σωκράτης τὴν Θρασυμάχου; πότε διεώσω χάριτας ἐμμίσθους ἀρχόντων, ὥσπερ Θεόφραστος τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Φαληρέως; ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν οὐδέν, ἡδονῶν δὲ ὑπερφρονεῖς οὐδὲ ἐπρίω 5 πόρνας ...;

1–2 *Pl. R. 337A3–7* 1–3 *Thphr. no. 29 FHS&G* 2–3 ἀρχόντων] cf. **23A–E**

2 διεώσω *w marg.*: διεσώσω *codd.* || ἐμμίσθους] ἐμμίσθου *a*: ἀμίσθου *a^c*: ἀμίσθους *a²*

- 9B** [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 850B–C (BT 5.2.1.43.11–17 Mau)

C Dinarchus, (a son) of Socrates or Sostratus, was according to some a native (of Athens) and according to others a Corinthian, who came to Athens while still young, at the time when Alexander marched against Asia. After settling there he regularly attended the lectures of Theophrastus, who had taken over the school of Aristotle, and he also associated with Demetrius of Phalerum.¹

¹ Alexander's Asian campaign started in 334. Cp. **9A** note 1.

- 10** Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.39 (OCT 1.216.7–9 Long)

It is said that after Aristotle's death¹ he (Theophrastus) even acquired a garden of his own. Demetrius of Phalerum, with whom he was also on familiar terms, helped him accomplish this.²

¹ In 322.

² Demetrius probably enabled him, a metic, to acquire a piece of landed property.

- 11** Themistius, *Orations* 21 252b (BT 2.31.4–7 Downey-Norman)

What sort of abuse have you had to endure, such as Socrates had to endure from Thrasyarchus? When did you reject the financial favours of the archons, as Theophrastus did those from the Phalerean? None of these (apply to you, you say,) and you despise sensual pleasures and never bought a whore ...?¹

¹ Themistius addresses the would-be philosopher. Besides Socrates and Theophrastus, he cites the instance of Xenocrates, who refused an offer of fifty talents made by Alexander. In Pl. *R.* 337A Thrasyarchus attacks Socrates because of what he thinks is Socrates' usual intentional deceitfulness (*eirōneia*).

Vita Publica

cf. SEG 27.1194, 28–9 = 151

Legatio ad Craterum a. 322

12 Demetrius, *De elocutione* 289 (BT 59.4–12 Radermacher)

7 W

183 W

πολλάκις δὲ ἢ πρὸς τύραννον ἢ ἄλλως βίαιόν τινα
 διαλεγόμενοι καὶ ὀνειδίσαι ὀρμῶντες χρήζομεν ἐξ
 ἀνάγκης σχήματος λόγου, ὡς Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς
 πρὸς Κρατερὸν τὸν Μακεδόνα ἐπὶ χρυσῆς κλίνης
 καθεζόμενον μετέωρον, καὶ ἐν πορφυρᾷ χλανίδι, καὶ 5
 ὑπερηφάνως ἀποδεχόμενον τὰς πρεσβείας τῶν Ἑλλή-
 νων, σχηματίσας εἶπεν ὀνειδιστικῶς, ὅτι “ὑπεδεξάμεθά
 ποτε πρεσβεύοντας ἡμεῖς τούσδε καὶ Κρατερὸν τοῦτον”·
 ἐν γὰρ τῷ δεικτικῷ τῷ ‘τοῦτον’ ἐμφαίνεται (ἢ) ὑπερ-
 ηφανία τοῦ Κρατεροῦ πᾶσα ὀνειδισμένη ἐν σχήματι. 10

1–10 Greg. Cor. in Hermog. Meth. VIII 71 (RhG 7.2.1180.11–20 Walz);
 cf. 131A–C 1–3 cf. Greg. Cor. in Hermog. Meth. VIII 70 (RhG
 7.2.1179.2–4 Walz)

1 βίαιόν] σκαιόν Greg. 71 3 σχήματος] ἐπικρύψεως σχήματος
 Greg. 71 || λόγου Finckh: ὅλου P Greg. 71 || ση τί τὸ λεγόμενον ποῖος
 (ποι) Δημήτριος καὶ τίς ὁ τάδε γράφων (γράφον) P mg. 8
 πρεσβεύοντας ἡμεῖς] καὶ ἡμεῖς πρεσβεύοντα Greg. 71 || τούσδε cod.
 m.: τόνδε P Greg. 71 9 τῷ] τὸ P 9–10 ἐμφαίνεται—σχήματι]
 πᾶσα ἢ τοῦ Κρ. ὑπ. ὀνειδισμένη (ὀνειδισαμένη Vind.) ἐπίκρυψιν
 ἐμφ. Greg. 71 9 ἢ accessit ex Greg. 71

Himeraeus, Demetrii frater, occisus a. 322

*13A Arrianus ap. Photium, *Bibliotheca*, 92 69b34–40 (CB 2.22.30–23.5 Henry)

ἐν δὲ τῷ ἔκτῳ διαλαμβάνει ὅπως ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν οἱ ἀμφὶ
 Δημοσθένην καὶ Ὑπερείδην ἔφυγον, Ἀριστόνικός τε ὁ
 Μαραθώνιος καὶ Ἱμεραῖος ὁ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως
 ἀδελφός, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα εἰς Αἴγιναν· ἐκεῖ δὲ διαγόντων

Public Life

cp. *SEG* 27.1194, 28–9 = **151**

Embassy to Craterus 322 B.C.

12 Demetrius, *On Style* 289 (*BT* 59.4–12 Radermacher)

When we address a tyrant or an otherwise powerful person and feel the urge to rebuke him, we are often forced by the circumstances to have recourse to a figure of speech. An example is Demetrius of Phalerum addressing the Macedonian Craterus. When the latter was receiving the embassies of the Greeks with insolent arrogance, sitting on a golden couch high above everyone else and clad in a purple robe, (Demetrius) said to him, using a figure of speech to convey a reproach, that “we too once received as ambassadors these men and this Craterus.” In the demonstrative ‘this’ all the insolence of Craterus stands implicitly rebuked through the use of a figure.¹

¹ After the battle of Crannon in 322, the Athenians sent negotiators to Antipater and Craterus to sue for peace (*Plu. Phoc.* 26–7; *D.S.* 18.17–18). Of these Demades, Phocion and Xenocrates (cp. **131A–C**) are mentioned by name. Demetrius is not mentioned elsewhere.

Himeraeus, Brother of Demetrius, Killed in 322 B.C.

***13A** Arrianus in Photius, *Library* 92 69b34–40 (*CB* 2.22.30–23.5 Henry)

In the sixth book he (Flavius Arrianus) sets out in detail how the partisans of Demosthenes and Hyperides fled from Athens:¹ Aristonicus of Marathon and Himeraeus the brother of Demetrius of Phalerum. At first (they fled) to Aegina, and while they were

θάνατον αὐτῶν κατέγνω τὸ Ἀθηναίων πλῆθος εἰπόντος 5
Δημάδου, καὶ Ἀντίπατρος εἰς ἔργον ἤγαγε τὸ ψήφισμα.

1–6 Arr. 156 F 9,13 FGrH (II B 842.34–843.4 Jacoby) = Arr. Hist. succ.
Alex. F 1,13 (BT 2.259.10–16 Roos-Wirth); cf. 43A.28–9 de
Himeraeo cf. IG II² 410,18; Din. F XIV 1–3 Conomis (= D.H. Din.
10.14; Harp. α 92; v 19); [Lucian.] Dem. Enc. 31; Arr. Hist. succ. Alex.
22 = Suda α 2703 = Arr. 156 F 176a FGrH; [Plu.] Vitae X or. 846A–C
= Phot. Bibl. 265 494a23–b2; Ibn Abi Usaibia, 'Uyun al-anba fi tabaqat
al-atibba' 20–1 (p. 216 Düring)

13B Plutarchus, Demosthenes 28.4 (BT 1.2.308.22–8 Ziegler)

134 W οὗτος οὖν ὁ Ἀρχίας Ὑπερείδην μὲν τὸν ῥήτορα καὶ
Ἀριστόνικον τὸν Μαραθώνιον καὶ τὸν Δημητρίου τοῦ
Φαληρέως ἀδελφὸν Ἱμεραῖον, ἐν Αἰγίνῃ καταφυγόντας
ἐπὶ τὸ Αἰάκειον, ἔπεμψεν ἀποσπάσας εἰς Κλεωνᾶς πρὸς
Ἀντίπατρον, καὶ ἐκεῖ διεφθάρησαν. Ὑπερείδου δὲ καὶ τὴν 5
γλῶτταν ἐκτμηθῆναι ζῶντος λέγουσι.

6 ζῶντος om. Y

Illustris habetur a. 320

14 Hieronymus, Interpretatio Chronicorum Eusebii ad Ol. 115,1
(GCS 24 [Eusebius 7] p. 126.2–3 Helm)

1 W Alexandrinorum Romanorum Primus Macedonum Primus a.Chr.
Syriae Asiae

CXV Olymp
V

Demetrius Falereus V 320
habetur inlustris

5 habetur inlustris] cf. 20B.1 et 1.22; 2.9; 16B; 17.8; 29.31; 42.7; 43A.31–
2; 58A.4; 64.5–6; cf. in quarto anno CXIV Olympiadis Theophrastus philoso-
phus agnoscitur, qui diuinitate loquendi, ut ait Cicero, nomen accepit (= *Thphr. app. no. 5B FHS&G*); et in CXVI Olympiadi Menedemus et
Speusippus philosophi insignes habentur

staying there, the Athenian popular assembly sentenced them to death on the proposal of Demades, and Antipater carried out the decree.

¹ Antipater had stipulated that Demosthenes, Hyperides and their partisans would be handed over to him (Plu. *Phoc.* 27.5). Archias was sent off to round up the fugitives (Plu. *Dem* 28.3).

13B Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 28.4 (BT 1.2.308.22–8 Ziegler)

When the orator Hyperides, Aristonicus of Marathon, and the brother of Demetrius of Phalerum, Himeraeus, had taken refuge in the sanctuary of Aeacus on Aegina, this Archias¹ dragged them away (from this place) and sent them to Antipater at Cleonae. There they were killed; it is said that Hyperides also had his tongue cut out while alive.

¹ On this Archias see Plu. *Dem.* 28.3 = 164.

Held in Great Renown 320 B.C.

14 Hieronymus, *Translation of Eusebius' Chronological Canons* Ol. 115,1 (GCS 24 [Eusebius 7] p. 126.2–3 Helm)

Demetrius of Phalerum is honored as a man of great distinction.¹

¹ The entry is put in the first year of the 115th Olympiad, 320/19; in the fifth year of the reign both of Ptolemy I in Egypt and of Philip III Arrhidaeus in Macedonia.

Capitis damnatus a. 318

15A Plutarchus, *Phocion* 35.4–5 (BT 2.1.29.26–30.3 Ziegler)

10W 4 ἐπικυρωθέντος δὲ τοῦ ψηφίσματος καὶ τῆς χειρο-
τονίας ἀποδοθείσης, οὐδεὶς καθήμενος, ἀλλὰ πάντες
ἐξαναστάντες, οἱ δὲ πλεῖστοι καὶ στεφανωσάμενοι,
5 κατεχειροτόνησαν αὐτῶν θάνατον. ἦσαν δὲ σὺν τῷ
Φωκίῳ Νικοκλῆς Θούδιππος Ἡγήμων Πυθοκλῆς· 5
Δημητρίου δὲ τοῦ Φαληρέως καὶ Καλλιμέδοντος καὶ
Χαρικλέους καὶ τινων ἄλλων ἀπόντων κατεψηφίσθη
θάνατος.

6–8 228 T 2b FGrH; de Demetrio et Nicanore v. **43A**.27–32

5 Ἡγήμων] ἡγήμων PQ: ἡγεμῶν Λ om. Z 7 ἀπόντων] ἀπάντων QZ

15B Nepos, *Phocion* 3.1–2 (BT 73.4–10 Marshall)

11W 1 erant eo tempore Athenis duae factiones, quarum una
populi causam agebat, altera optimatum. in hac erat
Phocion et Demetrius Phalereus. harum utraque Mace-
donum patrociniis utebatur: nam populares Polyperchonti
fauebant, optimates cum Cassandro sentiebant. interim a 5
2 Polyperchonte Cassandrus Macedonia pulsus est. quo facto
populus superior factus statim duces aduersariae factionis
capitis damnatos patria propulit, in his Phocionem et
Demetrium Phalereum.

Epimeletes a. 317

16A Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* 18.74.1–3 (BT 4.424.21–425.13 Fischer)

Ἀθηναίων δὲ μὴ δυναμένων ἀποτρίψασθαι τὴν
φρουρὰν μήτε διὰ τοῦ Πολυπέρχοντος μήτε δι' Ὀλυμπι-
άδος ἀπετόλμησέ τις τῶν ἐπαινουμένων πολιτῶν εἰπεῖν

Sentenced to Death 318 B.C.

15A Plutarch, *Phocion* 35.4–5 (BT 2.1.29.26–30.3 Ziegler)

- 4 When the decree had been ratified and the vote (by raising of
hands) was taken, nobody remained seated, but all rose from their
seats—most of them even put on garlands—and sentenced them
5 to death.¹ With Phocion (these) were Nicocles, Thudippus,
Hegemon and Pythocles. Demetrius of Phalerum, Callimedon,
Charicles and some others were sentenced to death while absent.

¹ After the death of Antipater in 319 Athens became embroiled in the conflict between Cassander and Polyperchon. In 318 Phocion advised Alexander, son of Polyperchon, to open negotiations, without consulting the Athenians, with Nicanor, who was holding Munychia and the Piraeus for Cassander. This led to a decree, that the people should vote on the question whether Phocion and his partisans were guilty of ‘treason’ or not, and that if they were, they should die (Plu. *Phoc.* 34.9; D.S. 18.66.4–67.3).

15B Nepos, *Phocion* 3.1–2 (BT 73.4–10 Marshall)

- 1 At that time there were two parties in Athens. One of them
favoured the cause of the people, the other that of the aristocrats.
Phocion and Demetrius of Phalerum belonged to the latter. Both
parties enjoyed Macedonian protection: for the popular party sup-
ported Polyperchon and the aristocrats sympathized with
Cassander. In the meantime Cassander was expelled from
2 Macedonia by Polyperchon,¹ and this caused the people to get the
upper hand. They at once sentenced the leaders of the opposite
party to death and expelled them from the fatherland. Phocion and
Demetrius of Phalerum were among them.

¹ Cp. D.S. 18.54.2–3.

Epimeletes 317 B.C.

16A Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History* 18.74.1–3 (BT 4.424.21–425.13 Fischer)

When the Athenians could not get rid of the garrison by the aid of either Polyperchon or Olympias, one of the esteemed citizens ventured to say in the assembly that it would be expedient to come

2 ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ διότι συμφέρει πρὸς Κάσανδρον διαλύ-
 σασθαι. τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον ἐγένετο θόρυβος, τῶν μὲν 5
 ἀντιλεγόντων, τῶν δὲ συγκατατιθεμένων τοῖς λόγοις· ὥς
 13 W δὲ ἀνεθεωρήθη τὸ συμφέρον, ἔδοξε τοῖς πᾶσι πρεσ-
 βεύειν πρὸς Κάσανδρον καὶ τίθεσθαι τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς
 3 ἂν ᾗ δυνατόν. γενομένων δὲ πλειόνων ἐντεύξεων
 συνέθεντο τὴν εἰρήνην ὥστε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἔχειν 10
 πόλιν τε καὶ χώραν καὶ προσόδους καὶ ναῦς καὶ τᾶλλα
 πάντα φίλους ὄντας καὶ συμμάχους Κασάνδρου, τὴν δὲ
 Μουνυχίαν κατὰ τὸ παρὸν κρατεῖν Κάσανδρον, ἕως ἂν
 13 W διαπολεμήσῃ πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς, καὶ τὸ πολίτευμα
 διοικεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τιμήσεων ἄχρι μνῶν δέκα, καταστήσαι 15
 δ' ἐπιμελητὴν τῆς πόλεως ἓνα ἄνδρα Ἀθηναῖον ὃν ἂν
 δόξῃ Κασάνδρῳ· καὶ ἡρέθη Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς.
 οὗτος δὲ παραλαβὼν τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς πόλεως ἦρχεν
 εἰρηνικῶς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας φιλανθρώπως.

10–12 et 15–19 228 T 3a FGrH 15–17 καταστήσαι—Φαληρεὺς]
 cf. 1.3–4; 2.5–6; 16B; 17.7–8; 18.3–5; 19.8–11; 22.5–6; 23E.7; 27.4–
 5; 28.6; 29.3–4; 30.11–12; 25–6; 36.10; 40.1–3; 42.5–7; 43A.31–2;
 44.2–3; 15; 54.4; 56.7–8; 89.16–17 18 ἐπιμελητὴν τῆς πόλεως]
 cf. 30.12 18–19 οὗτος—φιλανθρώπως] cf. 1.10–11; 16B; 19.10–
 11; 24B.1; 29.27; 31–2; 40.1–2; 42.5–6

15 μνῶν] μηνῶν F 16–17 Ἀθηναῖον—Κασάνδρῳ] om. F

16B *Inscriptiones Graecae* II² 1201

12 W [Θ] ε ο ί.
 [Ἀριστοκ]ράτης Ἀριστοφάνου εἶπεν· ἐπειδ-
 [ῆ Δημήτρ]ιος Φανοστράτου Φαληρεὺς ἀνὴρ
 [ἐστιν ἀγ]αθὸς περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίω-
 [ν καὶ τὸν δ]ῆμον τὸν Αἰξωνέων καὶ πολέμ[ου] 5
 [γενομένο]υ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ καὶ χωρισθέντ[ων τ]-
 [οῦ Πειραιῶ]ς καὶ τοῦ ἄστεως διὰ τὸν [πόλεμ]-
 [ον πρεσβεύσ]ας διέλυσε Ἀθηναίου[ς καὶ πά]-
 [λιν ἐπανήγα]γεν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ εἰ[ρήνην π]-

- 2 to terms with Cassander.¹ At first this caused an uproar, with some
 people protesting and others agreeing with the proposal. But after
 a careful examination of what would be expedient, it was unani-
 3 mously decided to send an embassy to Cassander and arrange
 matters with him in such a way as circumstances would allow. Af-
 ter several encounters they concluded peace on the following
 terms: the Athenians were to retain their city and territory and
 their revenues and ships and everything else, as friends and allies
 of Cassander; for the time being Munychia was to remain under
 the control of Cassander until he ended the war against the kings;²
 the government was to be managed on the basis of property quali-
 fications of up to (a minimum of) ten minae,³ and they were to ap-
 point as overseer of the city one Athenian, who had the approval
 of Cassander.⁴ Demetrius of Phalerum was elected.⁵ He assumed
 the supervision of the city and ruled in a peaceful and—in relation
 to the citizens—caring way.

¹ Nicanor still occupied Munychia, although Olympias had ordered him to return it to the Athenians (D.S. 18.65.1–2); Cassander held the Piraeus (68.1). Polyperchon tried to take the Piraeus but was forced to depart himself, leaving his son Alexander in Attica (68.2–3). Cassander sent Nicanor to the Hellespont, where Polyperchon's fleet was defeated by Nicanor and Antigonos (72.3–9); this weakened Polyperchon's position.

² I.e., the other Diadochi.

³ I.e., 1,000 drachmae.

⁴ The office of *epimeletes* was an elected office in democratic Athens, but in the context of the Macedonian rulers it had distinctly military overtones in the sense of a military commander of a garrison in occupied territory (e.g., D.S. 19.64.1; 20.4.1; 18.55.1).

⁵ On the 'election' see Habicht *Athen* 62⁴³ and Tracy *ADT* 46 with note 58.

16B *Inscriptiones Graecae* II² 1201

Gods

Aristocrates, son of Aristophanes, made the proposal: since Demetrius, son of Phanostratus, of Phalerum is a man who has benefited the people of the Athenians and the deme of Aixone;¹ and, when war broke out in the country and the Piraeus became separated from the city due to the war, he acted as an ambassador, reconciling the Athenians and again bringing them back to the

[αρεσκεύασε Ἀθηναίοις καὶ τεῖ χώ[ραι καὶ]
[..... αἰ]ρεθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμο[υ τοῦ Ἀθ]-
[ηναίων νόμου]ς ἔθ[η]κεν καλ[οῦ]ς [καὶ συμφέρ]-
[οντας τεῖ πόλει]· ὕστερον [δὲ]

10

‘DECRETUM AEXONENSIVM IN HONOREM DEMETRII PHALEREI. In loco antiqui
demi Aixone, nunc in museo nat. Tabula aetomate superata a. 0,22, l.
0,29, cr. 0,06.’ *Kirchner* || *stoichedon* 33 nisi l. 6 et fort. l. 11 (v. *infra*)
|| *edd. Koehler IG II* 584; *Kirchner IG II*² 1201 (*addenda* p. 672);
*Dittenberger Syll.*³ 318; *Dow & Travis, Hesperia* 12 (1943) 149–50; cf.
SEG 28 (1978) 101; 29 (1979) 130; *de hoc titulo* v. *Wilhelm, GGA* 160
(1898) 223; 165 (1903) 784; *Keil, EIPHNH* 71¹; *Dow & Travis,*
Hesperia 12 (1943) 149–56; *Bayer DPhA* 17–20; *De Sanctis, Scritti*
Minori I 259⁶; *Habicht Athen* 64; *Tracy ADT* 43–6 2–5 cf. e.g. *IG*
*II*² 1214,1–4 (a. 300–250) 3 Φανοστράτου] v. *ad* 1.2 9 cf. *SEG*
25.89,30–1 (a. 282/1) 12 [νόμους] ἔθ[η]κεν] cf. **20A.2** 12–13
cf. *SEG* 25.112,15–16 (a. 196/5) et *IG II*² 834,22 (*paullo post* a. 229)

2 [Ἀριστοκ]ράτης *Koehler ex IG II*² 1202,6 (a. 313/2) 3, 4, 5, 6
Koehler 6 versus 34 litteras habet: in χωρισθέντ[ων] litterae ΠΙΣ
idem spatium occupant quod litterae ΑΙ in versu superiore 7 in.
Koehler 7 fin., 8 in. *Dittenberger coll.* **16A.7–8**: [πόλεμιον εἰς
μερίδ]ας, *Koehler* 8 fin., 9 in. *Koehler* 9 εἰ[ρήνην] *Wilhelm*
1898, 223 9 fin., 10 in. *Keil, EIPHNH* 71¹: εἰ[ρήνην] κλατεστήσατο
Ἀθηναίοις *Wilhelm* 1898, 223: σ[ῖτον] εἰσήγαγεν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις
Koehler 10 fin. *Koehler* 11 [ἐπιμελητὴς αἰ]ρεθεὶς *Wilhelm*
1903, 784 (‘*iudicans* v. 11 *πῖ* in voce ἐπιμελητὴς in uno spatio exaratum
fuisse’ *Kirchner*; cf. *ad* 6) *coll.* **16A.15–17** et **30.12**: [ἐπιστάτης αἰ]ρε- →

Decennium a. 317–307

de decennio cf. **1.3–4**; **19.4–5**; **30.25–6**; **23A** et **26**; praeterea
cf. **1.10–12**; **2.5–6**; **22.5–6**; **23E.7**; **27.4–5**; **28.6**; **29.3–4**;
30.11–12; **36.10**; **40.1–2**; **42.5–7**; **44.2–3**; **54.4**; **56.7–8**; de
administratione aerarii cf. **43A.4–5**; **43B.4–5**; **89.16–21**

17 Pausanias, *Graeciae descriptio* 1.25.6 (BT 1.56.31–57.8
Rocha-Pereira)

14 W

Ἀντιπάτρου δὲ ἀποθανόντος Ὀλυμπιάς διαβᾶσα ἐξ
Ἡπείρου χρόνον μὲν τινα ἤρξεν ἀποκτείνασα Ἀρι-
δαῖον, οὐ πολλῶ δὲ ὕστερον ἐκπολιορκηθεῖσα ὑπὸ
Κασσάνδρου παρεδόθη τῷ πλήθει. Κάσσανδρος δὲ
βασιλεύσας—τὰ δὲ ἐπ’ Ἀθηναίους ἐπέξεισί μοι μόνα ὁ 5

former condition of unity and effecting peace for the Athenians and their country; and having been elected² by the people of the Athenians, he made laws which are fine and beneficial to the city;³ and later ...⁴

¹ Aixone is a coastal deme of the phyle Cecropis on the West coast of Attica; starting from the Piraeus, it is the second deme after Phalerum (Str. 9.1.21).

² The inscription is 'monospaced' (*stoichedon*) and for the title to be supplied in l. 11 a word of 9 letters is needed. For the suggested supplements see Dow and Travis, *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 149–56. Serious candidates are *epimeletes* (on the assumption that the stonecutter crowded in the I as he did in l. 6; see Tracy *ADT* 45–6); *strategos* (see Habicht *Athen* 64⁴⁸); *nomothetes* (Dow and Travis 153–6). What appeared to be an important piece of evidence in support of *strategos*, *IG* II² 2971, no longer counts as such, for Tracy has shown that this inscription applies to Demetrius' grandson and not to Demetrius himself (see 162). The date of the decree is uncertain (cp. 20A). The proposer of the decree himself, Aristocrates, is honored in a decree of 313/2 (*IG* II² 1202,6).

³ The text referring to the laws in ll. 12–13 is based upon (not improbable) supplements by Wilhelm; cp. 20A.

⁴ According to Dow & Travis 150¹⁷ the stele had "as many as 20 more lines of text."

θεῖς Koehler coll. 19.8–9: προστάτην dubitanter Koehler, coll. 89.17: [στρατηγὸς αἰ]ρεθεῖς *De Sanctis* I 259⁶, coll. 28.6: [νομοθέτης αἰ]ρεθεῖς Dow & Travis 11 *fin.*, 12, 13 Wilhelm 1903, 784, coll. [Plu.] *Vitae X orat.* 852B et *Luc. Anach.* 17

Ten Years' Administration 317–307 B.C.

on the ten years' administration cp. 1.3–4; 19.4–5; 30.25–6; 23A and 26; cp. further 1.10–12; 2.5–6; 22.5–6; 23E.7; 27.4–5; 28.6; 29.3–4; 30.11–12; 36.10; 40.1–2; 42.5–7; 44.2–3; 54.4; 56.7–8; on the financial administration cp. 43A.4–5; 43B.4–5; 89.16–21

- 17 Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 1.25.6 (*BT* 1.56.31–57.8 Rocha-Pereira)

After the death of Antipater,¹ Olympias crossed over from Epirus and ruled a (brief) time after she killed Arrhidaeus. Not much later she was besieged and forced to surrender by Cassander and handed over to the mob. After he had become king²—I will only relate what concerns the Athenians—Cassan-

λόγος—Πάνακτον τεῖχος ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ καὶ Σαλαμῖνα εἶλε τύραννόν τε Ἀθηναίοις ἔπραξε γενέσθαι Δημήτριον τὸν Φανοστράτου, [τὰ πρὸς] δόξαν εἰληφότα ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ. τοῦτον μὲν δὴ τυραννίδος ἔπαυσε Δημήτριος ὁ Ἀντιγόνου, ...

10

4–10 228 *T 3c FGrH* 4–8 Κάσσανδρος—Φανοστράτου] *cf.* 16A.15–17 7 τύραννον] *cf.* 44.15 8 Φανοστράτου] *v. ad* 1.2 || τὰ—σοφίᾳ] *cf.* 1.22; 2.9; 14; 29.31; 42.7; 56.8; 58A.4; 62.5–6; 63.10–11; 64.5–6

5 ἐπ'] ἐς *Sylburg* 8 τὰ πρὸς *V²MaL*, *del. Hitzig*: τὰ πατρὸς *VP*: πατρὸς *F*

18 Plutarchus, *Demetrius* 10.2 (BT 3.1.11.20–5 Ziegler)

26 W Ἀθηναῖοι δ' ἀπολαβόντες τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ, τὸν δὲ μέσον χρόνον ἀπὸ τῶν Λαμιακῶν καὶ τῆς περὶ Κραννῶνα μάχης λόγῳ μὲν ὀλιγαρχικῆς, ἔργῳ δὲ μοναρχικῆς καταστάσεως γενομένης διὰ τὴν τοῦ Φαληρέως δύναμιν, ...

5

3–5 λόγῳ—δύναμιν] *cf.* 23E.7; 27.4–5

2 τὸν δὲ μέσον] τὸν διὰ μέσου *Ziegler post Reiske*

19 Strabo, *Geographica* 9.1.20 (CB 6.65.13–66.17 Baladié)

27/131 W καὶ γὰρ εἴ τι μικρὸν ὑπὸ τῶν Μακεδονικῶν βασιλέων παρελυπήθησαν, ὥσθ' ὑπακούειν αὐτῶν ἀναγκασθῆναι, τὸν γε ὀλοσχερῇ τύπον τῆς πολιτείας τὸν αὐτὸν διετήρουν. ἔνιοι δέ φασι καὶ βέλτιστα τότε αὐτοὺς πολιτεύσασθαι δεκαετῇ χρόνον ὃν ἦρχε Μακεδόνων 5 Κάσσανδρος. οὗτος γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ πρὸς μὲν τὰ ἄλλα δοκεῖ τυραννικώτερος γενέσθαι, πρὸς Ἀθηναίους δὲ εὐγνωμόνησε λαβὼν ὑπήκοον τὴν πόλιν· ἐπέστησε γὰρ τῶν πολιτῶν Δημήτριον τὸν Φαληρέα τῶν Θεοφράστου τοῦ φιλοσόφου γνωρίμων, ὃς οὐ μόνον οὐ κατέλυσε τὴν 10 δημοκρατίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπηνώρθωσε (δηλοῖ δὲ τὰ ὑπομνήματα ἃ συνέγραψε περὶ τῆς πολιτείας ταύτης ἐκεῖνος)· ἀλλ' οὕτως ὁ φθόνος ἴσχυσε καὶ ἡ πρὸς ὀλίγους ἀπέχθεια ὥστε μετὰ τὴν Κασάνδρου τελευτὴν ἦναγ-

55 W

der took Panactum, a stronghold in Attica, and Salamis, and he arranged for Demetrius to be made tyrant over the Athenians, son of Phanostratus, a man who had acquired a reputation for wisdom. To his tyranny Demetrius, son of Antigonos, put an end ...³

¹ In 319.

² Eurydice, wife of Philip Arrhidaeus, invested Cassander with royal powers in 317.

³ This passage is part of a digression about the history of Athens after Chaeronea in 338. Pausanias goes on to say (again using the words *tyrannos* and *tyrannis*) that Cassander later tried to do the same thing with Lachares, and that again it was Demetrius Poliorcetes who threw Lachares out (1.25.7–8).

18 Plutarch, *Demetrius* 10.2 (BT 3.1.11.20–5 Ziegler)

The Athenians recovered their democracy in the fifteenth year; whereas in the intervening period, beginning with the Lamian War and the battle of Crannon,¹ the constitution had been oligarchical in name but monarchical in fact, owing to the power of the Phalerean ...

¹ In 322. The beginning of Demetrius' 'power' is here put by implication at an earlier date than his election as *epimeletes* in 317 (16A); cp. however, 12, and the statement of Demetrius of Magnesia in D.L. 5.75 = 1.7–10.

19 Strabo, *Geography* 9.1.20 (CB 6.65.13–66.17 Baladié)

For even if they (the Athenians) were subjected to some pressure by the Macedonian kings so that they had to obey them, they at least kept their form of government on the whole unchanged.¹ Some people say that at that time their government actually was at its best, during the ten years when Cassander ruled over the Macedonians.² For although this man appears to have been more tyrannical toward the other (nations), he adopted a kind attitude towards the Athenians, once he had subjugated the city. For he gave authority over the citizens to Demetrius of Phalerum, who belonged to the circle around the philosopher Theophrastus; this man not only did not put an end to the democracy but even restored its former power (that is shown by the treatises this man has written about that form of government); but the envy and hate for the oligarchs grew so strong that after Cassander's death he

κάσθη φυγεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, τὰς δ' εἰκόνας αὐτοῦ 15
πλείους ἢ τριακοσίας κατέσπασαν οἱ ἐπαναστάντες καὶ
κατεχώνευσαν, ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ προστιθέασιν ὅτι καὶ εἰς
Ἀμίδας.

4–18 228 T 3b = F 34 FGrH 4–5 βέλτιστα—πολιτεύσασθαι] cf.
1.10–11; 16A.18–19; 16B.3–5; 24B.1–2; 29.31; 42.5–6 5
δεκαετῇ χρόνον] v. ad 1.4 8–9 ἐπέστησε—Φαληρέα] cf. 16A.15–
17 9 Thphr. no. 18.5 FHS&G 10–11 ὅς—ἐπηνώρθωσε] cf. 20B.2;
39; 56.7–8 12 ὑπο-μνήματα] cf. 1.61, 66, 85–6; 2.4 13 φθόνος]
v. ad 1.22–4 14–15 ἠναγ-κάσθη—Αἴγυπτον] cf. 1.34–6 15–18
Overbeck no. 1439; cf. 1.26–8

[B = Vatop. 655 (= W)] 9–10 τῶν ... γνωρίμων AE: τῶν ...
γνώριμον av, τὸν ... γνώριμον B 16 ἢ τριακοσίας Xylander: ἢ
τριακοσίων A, ἢ τ' BvE; τῶν τριακοσίων n

Legislator a. 317/6

20A *Marmor Parium* B 15–16, Ep. 13 (239 FGrH II B 1003.25–7
Jacoby)

15 W ἀπὸ τῆς Κλείτου | ναυμα[χί]ας καὶ Νικάνορος περὶ τὸ
ἱερὸν τὸ Καλχηδονίων, καὶ ὅτε Δημήτριος νόμους ἔθηκεν
Ἀθήνησιν, ἔτη ϞIII, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Δημογένους.

1–3 cf. Jacoby MP 22; 127; 198; cf. Ep. 19 (a. 309/8) = 23A et 20 (a.
308/7) = 26 2–3 228 T 3d FGrH 2 νόμους ἔθηκεν] cf. 16B.12;
43A.14–15; 58A.3; 104.18; 40.4–5

20B Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* p. 521 Dind.
(BT 331.6–7 Mosshammer)

17 W Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐγνωρίζετο γ' νομοθέτης
Ἀθήνησιν. οὗτος Ἀθηναίοις ἀποδοὺς τὴν δημοκρατίαν
ἦλθεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον.

1–3 haec verba sub titulo σποράδην, de quo v. Mosshammer p. xxvii;
228 T 3d FGrH 1 ἐγνωρίζετο] cf. 14 || γ' νομοθέτης] cf. 58A.3
2 ἀποδοὺς τὴν δημ.] cf. 39 et v. ad 19.10–11

(Demetrius) was forced to flee to Egypt,³ and his images, more than three hundred, were pulled down by the insurgents and melted down; some also add that they were even (made) into chamber-pots.

¹ In 9.1.20 Strabo argues that the Athenians kept their democracy basically intact until the Roman supremacy. The passage cited here is a footnote to that statement.

² Strabo seems to confuse Cassander's control of Athens through Demetrius of Phalerum (cp. 89.25–6) with Cassander's own position in Macedonia.

³ Cassander died in 298/7. This date is considerably later than that given by 26 (307).

Lawgiver 317/6 B.C.

20A *Marmor Parium* B 15–16, Ep. 13 (239 *FGrH* II B 1003.25–7 Jacoby)

There are 53 years (to the present¹) from the naval battle of Clitus² and Nicanor in the vicinity of the precinct of the Chalcedonians and (from) the time when Demetrius made laws in Athens, in the year when Demogenes was archon in Athens.

¹ The *Marmor Parium* was composed in 264/3. For the difference in date with D.S. 18.74.1–3 (= 16A) (a. 318/7), see Jacoby *FGrH* II b 700¹ on 239 B 9–27.

² Clitus was commander of Polyperchon's fleet; see 16A note 1.

20B Georgius Syncellus, *Chronological Abstract* p. 521 Dind. (*BT* 331.6–7 Mosshammer)

Demetrius of Phalerum was known as the third lawgiver in Athens.¹ After having restored democracy to the Athenians he went to Egypt.²

¹ The two others are probably Solon and Draco; cp. Dow & Travis, *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 156³⁹.

² This entry is under the heading “miscellaneous” at the end of a paragraph on the period 323 to 225 B.C.

Bellum Antigoni et Cassandri a. 314–311

- 21 Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* 19.68.2–3 (BT 5.109.5; 8–16 Fischer)

45 W 3 ὁ δὲ Κάσανδρος ... ἐξέπεμψε δύναμιν εἰς τὴν Καρίαν, ἅμα μὲν βουλόμενος βοηθεῖν τοῖς συμμάχοις, ἅμα δὲ σπεύδων εἰς περισπασμοὺς ἐμβαλεῖν Ἀντίγονον, ἵνα μὴ σχολὴν ἔχῃ διαβαίνειν εἰς τὴν Εὐρώπην. ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ πρὸς Δημήτριον τὸν Φαληρέα καὶ Διονύσιον τὸν φρουροῦντα τὴν Μουνυχίαν, προστάττων εἴκοσι ναῦς εἰς Λῆμνον ἐκπέμψαι. ἀποστειλάντων δ' αὐτῶν εὐθὺς τὰ σκάφη καὶ ναύαρχον ἐπ' αὐτῶν Ἀριστοτέλη οὗτος μὲν καταπλεύσας εἰς Λῆμνον ... 5

- 22 Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* 19.78.3–5 (BT 5.126.4–17 Fischer)

46 W 3 ὁ δ' οὖν Πτολεμαῖος ἐκπολιορκήσας Ὠρωπὸν παρέδωκε τοῖς Βοιωτοῖς καὶ τοὺς Κασάνδρου στρατιώτας ὑποχειρίους ἔλαβε. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἐρετριεῖς καὶ Καρυστῖους εἰς τὴν συμμαχίαν προσλαβόμενος ἐστράτευσεν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως 5 4 ἐπιστατοῦντος τῆς πόλεως. οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον λάθρα διεπέμποντο πρὸς Ἀντίγονον, ἀξιοῦντες ἐλευθερῶσαι τὴν πόλιν· τότε δὲ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου παραγεννηθέντος πλησίον τῆς πόλεως θαρρήσαντες ἠνάγκασαν τὸν Δημήτριον ἀνοχὰς ποιήσασθαι καὶ 10 πρεσβείας ἀποστέλλειν πρὸς Ἀντίγονον περὶ συμμαχίας. 5 ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος ἀναζεύξας ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν τὴν τε Καδμεῖαν εἶλε καὶ τὴν φρουρὰν ἐκβαλὼν ἠλευθέρωσε τὰς Θήβας.

6 ἐπιστατοῦντος] cf. 19.8; 30.26

1 Πτολεμαῖος *Palmerius* (cf. 8, 12): Πολέμων *RF*: Πολεμαῖος *Bizièrè ex IG II² 469,3 (iterum 8, 12); cf. Lenschau RE 21.1, 1252*

The War between Antigonus and Cassander 314–311 B.C.

- 21** Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History* 19.68.2–3 (BT 5.109.5; 8–16 Fischer)

Cassander ... sent off a force to Caria, both wishing to support his allies and eager to throw Antigonus into confusion, in order that he would not be at liberty to cross over to Europe. He also wrote to Demetrius of Phalerum and Dionysius, commander of the garrison on Munychia, ordering them to send out twenty ships to Lemnos. They immediately sent off the boats with Aristotle as their commander. He sailed down to Lemnos ...¹

¹ This episode belongs to the ‘Third Diadoch War’ (314–311), with Cassander and Antigonus Monophthalmus as the main antagonists. R.M. Errington, *Hermes* 105 (1977) 498, 500 puts this expedition in “deep autumn—perhaps October—” of 313.

- 22** Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History* 19.78.3–5 (BT 5.126.4–17 Fischer)

3 Having taken Oropus¹ by siege, Ptolemaeus² handed (it) over to the Boeotians and made captives of Cassander’s soldiers. After that he received the Eretrians and Carystians³ into the alliance and marched into Attica. At that time Demetrius of Phalerum was at the head of the government of the city. At first the Athenians secretly sent messages to Antigonus asking him to liberate the city. But then, when Ptolemaeus appeared quite close to the city, they took courage and forced Demetrius to conclude a truce and send off deputations to Antigonus about an alliance. Ptolemaeus moved out of Attica into Boeotia, captured the Cadmea, and having thrown out the garrison liberated Thebes.⁴

¹ Oropus, on the Boeotian coast facing Euboea, had been taken shortly before by Cassander (D.S. 19.77.6).

² Ptolemaeus, or more correctly Polemaeus, was a nephew of Antigonus and his right hand in the years 314–310.

³ Eretria and Carystus are both on the coast of Euboea.

⁴ Cassander had left a garrison in Thebes (D.S. 19.77.6). Errington (21 note 1) 498, 500 puts the events related here in the summer of 312.

Archon Eponymus a. 309/8

cf. 1.32–3; 11.2–3; 43A.22; 25

23A *Marmor Parium* B 22–4, Ep. 19 (239 FGrH II B 1004.9–12 Jacoby)

18 W ἀφ' οὗ Λ[υσι]μάχεια πόλις ἐκτίσθη, καὶ Ὀφέλας εἰς
[Κα]ρχ[ηδόνα ... 30–40 ...]σῶι καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ υἱὸς ἐγ
Κῶι ἐγένετο, καὶ Κλ[εοπ]άτρᾳ ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἀπέθαν[ε ...
± 35 ... ἔτη ΔΔΔΔΓ, ἄρχοντος Ἀ]θήνησ[ι Δ]ημητρίου.

1–4 cf. *Jacoby MP* 23; 129–131; 201; cf. *Ep.* 13 (a. 317/6) = **20A**; *Ep.* 20 (a. 308/7) = **26**

2 Καρχ[ηδόνα μεταβὰς ἀνηιρέθη — νό]σῶι καὶ *Wilhelm, AM* 22 (1897) 206–7: Καρχηδ[όνα στρατεύσας ἐτελεύτησε] καὶ *Munro, CR* 15 (1901) 361: Καρχηδ[όνα ἐστράτευσε καὶ Πτολεμαῖος (vel Μάγας) Κυρήνην ἔλαβεν] *dubitanter Jacoby* 3 ἀπέθαν[ε καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ Πτολεμαῖος εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα διέβη] *Wilhelm, AM* 22 (1897) 209

***23B** *Agora* XIX, H 84

[ἐπὶ Δη]μητρίου ἄρχον-
[τος ὅρ]ος οἰκίας πεπραμ-
[ένης] ἐπὶ λύσει : ΠΗΗ
[ἐρα]νισταῖς *vacat*

1–4 'A stele of Pentelic marble, broken on the left side and bottom ... Found ... in a cistern of the 1st century B.C., northwest of the Church of Dionysios the Areopagite.'; ed. *B.D. Merritt, Hesperia* 10 (1941) no. 18 p. 54–5 (*Inv. no.* I 1978); cf. *SEG* 41.133; *Tracy ADT* 39¹⁸

***23C** *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 35.136

ὅρον (sic) ... μυλῶνος καὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς τῆς περὶ τὸν
μυλῶνα πεπραμένων ἐπὶ λύσει ... ἐπὶ Δημητρίου
ἄρχοντος.

1–3 'ELEUSIS. SECURITY HOROS, 309/8 B.C. Rough stone found in excavations of the Greek Archaeological Service at the intersection of Aischylos and Pankratos Streets'; cf. *Th. Karageorgha, AD* 33 (1978) [1985] B 31; *H.W. Catling, AR* 32 (1985/6) [1986] 16

Eponymous Archon 309/8 B.C.

cp. 1.32–3; 11.2–3; 43A.22; 25

23A *Marmor Parium* B 22–4, Ep. 19 (239 *FGrH* II B 1004.9–12 Jacoby)

(Reckoning) from the time when the city of Lysimachia was founded, and Ophelas to Carthage ... 30–40 letters ... and Ptolemy the son was born in Cos¹ and Cleopatra² died in Sardis and ... c. 35 letters ..., (to the present³) 45 years, in the year that Demetrius was archon in Athens.

¹ Ptolemy II Philadelphus, son of Ptolemy I Soter.

² Cleopatra, sister of Alexander the Great, was killed in Sardis by order of Antigonos (D.S. 20.37.3–6).

³ See **20A** note 1.

***23B** *Agora* XIX, H 84

During the archonship of Demetrius: pillar of notification of the sale of a house for the redemption (of a mortgage): 700 (drachmae) for the members of the society.¹

¹ Lines 1–4 were imperfectly erased (the letters are still legible in the erasure) to make way for a similar notification (H 78) dated to the archonship of Caerimus (308/7).

***23C** *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 35.136

Pillar of notification of (the) mill and the fixtures of the mill sold for the redemption (of a mortgage) ... during the archonship of Demetrius.¹

¹ This can hardly be anyone else than Demetrius of Phalerum (cp. Catling: “Only one street surface was preserved, containing late 4th cent. B.C. pottery. An inscription was found cut in one of the blocks of the street kerb wall.”), but it is not as certain as in the case of **23B**.

23D Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* 20.27.1 (BT 5.211.1–3 Fischer)

^{19 W} ἐπ' ἄρχοντος δ' Ἀθήνησι Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως τὴν ὑπατον ἀρχὴν ἐν Ῥώμῃ παρέλαβον Κόιντος Φάβιος τὸ δεύτερον καὶ Γάιος Μάρκιος.

***23E** Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *De Dinarcho* 9.2 (CB 5.133.11–15; 134.5–8 Aujac)

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀναγκαία πρὸς ταῦτα ἡ τῶν χρόνων διάγνωσις, τοὺς Ἀθήνησιν ἄρξαντας, ἀφ' οὗ Δείναρχον ὑπεθέμεθα γεγονέναι χρόνου, μέχρι τῆς δοθείσης αὐτῷ μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν καθόδου, γενομένους ἑβδομήκοντα, προθήσομεν. εἰσὶ δὲ οἶδε· Νικόφημος ... Ἱερομνήμων, 5
Δημήτριος, Καίριμος, Ἀναξικράτης· ἐπὶ τούτου ἡ κατασταθεῖσα ὑπὸ Κασσάνδρου ὀλιγαρχία κατελύθη, καὶ οἱ εἰσαγγελθέντες ἔφυγον, ἐν οἷς καὶ Δείναρχος ἦν.

6 Ἀναξικράτης Sylburg: Ἀναρχικράτης F

Honores Publici/Statuae

cf. 1.4–7; 26–9; 111–13; **19.15–18; 152**

24A Nepos, *Miltiades* 6.2–4 (BT 5.26–6.6 Marshall)

2 ut enim populi Romani honores quondam fuerunt rari et
tenuēs ob eamque causam gloriosi, nunc autem effusi atque
obsoleti, sic olim apud Athenienses fuisse reperimus.
3 namque huic Miltiadi, qui Athenas totamque Graeciam libe-
rarat, talis honos tributus est, in porticu, quae Poecile 5
uocatur, cum pugna depingeretur Marathonica, ut in decem

- 23D** Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History* 20.27.1 (BT 5.211.1–3 Fischer)

In the year when Demetrius of Phalerum was archon in Athens, Quintus Fabius, for the second time, and Gaius Marcius took over the consulate in Rome.¹

¹ This chapter of D.S. is the beginning of Olympiad 117,4 = 309/8. The Roman consuls were Q. Fabius M. f. N. n. Rullianus II and C. Marcius C. f. L. n. Rutilus (Censorinus).

- *23E** Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Dinarchus* 9.2 (CB 5.133.11–15; 134.5–8 Aujac)

Since for this purpose¹ it is necessary to determine the chronology of the period, we will list those who have held the office of archon in Athens, from the time Dinarchus as we take it was born, up to the time when it was granted to him to return after his exile. These, seventy in number, are the following: Nicophemus ... Hieromnemon, Demetrius, Caerimus, Anaxicrates;² during the tenure of the last-named the oligarchy set up by Cassander was dissolved, and those who had been impeached fled the country, Dinarchus amongst them.

¹ That of distinguishing between genuine and spurious speeches of Dinarchus.

² Eponymous archons in 361/0 and 310/09, 309/8, 308/7 and 307/06 respectively.

Public Honors/Statues

cf. 1.4–7; 26–9; 111–13; **19.15–18; 152**

- 24A** Nepos, *Miltiades* 6.2–4 (BT 5.26–6.6 Marshall)

- 2 The honors awarded by the Roman people once were rare and slight, and for that very reason full of glory;¹ nowadays they are lavishly bestowed and of little worth. We find that the same was
3 the case among the Athenians a long time ago. For the very man who had liberated Athens and the whole of Greece, Miltiades, was awarded the honor of having his image placed foremost amongst the ten archons in the painting of the Battle of Marathon

21 W 4 praetorum numero prima eius imago poneretur isque
hortaretur milites proeliumque committeret. idem ille
populus, posteaquam maius imperium est nactus et
largitione magistratuum corruptus est, trecentas statuas 10
Demetrio Phalereo decreuit.

4–8 namque—committeret] *cf. Paus. 1.15.3* 8–11 *Overbeck no. 1438*

***24B** Ampelius, *Liber Memorialis* 15.19 (BT 31.10–13 Assmann)

Demetrius Phalereus <qui> vir bonus existimatus ob
insignem iustitiam ideoque statuis CCC est honoratus, quas
ei pro libertate posuerunt in facie publica.

1 ob insignem iustitiam] *cf. 16A.18–19; 29.31*

1 qui *add. Halm* 1–2 ideoque ob insignem iusticiam *M: transp. Assmann* 3 pro libertate] pro liberalitate *Zink, Eos 2 (1866) 317–8; cf. 24A.10* || facie] arce *Perizonius, cf. 1.29: statione Zink, l.l., sed cf. Assmann p. xxiv*

24C Nonius Marcellus, *De Conpendiosa Doctrina* XII (BT 3.848.22–849.2 Lindsay)

23 W LVCIS, numero plurali, quod sunt dies. Varro Heb-
domadum sub imagine Demetri:
híc Demétrius ést † catus
quót lucís habet ánnus ábsolútus;

4 quot—absolutus] *cf. 25A.3–4*

3 ést † catus] est tot aptu' signa *Quicherat: iconas tot aptust Roeper: aeneas (aereas Schrader) tot aptust Scaliger*

25A Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* 34.12.27 (CB 117.12–16 Le Bonniec)

22 W primus tamen honos coepit a Graecis, nullique arbitror
plures statuas dicatas quam Phalereo Demetrio Athenis,

- 4 in the Stoa Poikile, i.e. (in a position) to exhort the soldiers and to commence the battle. This same people has, after it had acquired a greater empire and been corrupted by the largesse of the public officers, awarded three hundred statues to Demetrius of Phalerum.²

¹ Nepos argues that the nature of all states is essentially the same. This belief is further explained (*enim*) in this passage.

² The figures range from 300 (**24A**, **24B**, **25B**), more than 300 (**19.16**), 360 (**1.4–5**, **24C**, **25A**) to 1,500 (**25C**).

***24B** Ampelius, *Book of Memoranda* 15.19 (*BT* 31.10–13 Assmann)

Demetrius of Phalerum, who was esteemed a good man because of his outstanding justness and therefore was honored with 300 statues, which they erected for him in public in return for their liberty.¹

¹ Demetrius is the last in a list of ‘Illustrious kings and leaders of the Athenians’, including Cecrops, Erichthonius, Pandion, Theseus, Demophon, Codrus, Pisistratus, Harmodius and Aristogiton, Miltiades, Aristides the Just, Cimon, Alcibiades, Thrasybulus, Conon, Dion, Iphicrates, Phocion and Chabrias.

24C Nonius Marcellus, *Dictionary of Republican Latin* XII (*BT* 3.848.22–849.2 Lindsay)

‘Lucis’, plural, that is ‘days’. Varro in his *Hebdomades* under the image of Demetrius:

This is Demetrius †Catus†
as many as there are days in a complete year.

25A Pliny, *Natural History* 34.12.27 (*CB* 117.12–16 Le Bonniec)

This way of honouring people,¹ however, started first with the Greeks, and to no one, I think, were more statues dedicated than to Demetrius of Phalerum in Athens, if it is true that 360 (stat-

siquidem CCCLX statuere, nondum anno hunc numerum
dierum excedente, quas mox laceravere.

1–4 *Overbeck no. 1437* 3–4 nondum—excedente] cf. **24C.4**

3 CCCLX *VRdh*: CCCXL *BT*

25B Plutarchus, *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* 27 820E (BT
5.1.114.3–11 Hubert)

οὐ γὰρ μισθὸν εἶναι δεῖ τῆς πράξεως ἀλλὰ σύμβολον
τὴν τιμὴν, ἵνα καὶ διαμένη πολὺν χρόνον, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖναι
διέμειναν. τῶν δὲ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως τριακοσίων
ἀνδριάντων οὐδεὶς ἔσχεν ἰὸν οὐδὲ πίνον, ἀλλὰ πάντες
ἔτι ζῶντος προανηρέθησαν· τοὺς δὲ Δημάδου κατε- 5
χώνευσαν εἰς ἀμίδας· καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα τιμαὶ
πεπόνθασιν οὐ μοχθηρία τοῦ λαβόντος μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ
μεγέθει τοῦ δοθέντος δυσχερανθεῖσαι.

3–5 *Overbeck no. 1440*

3 τριακοσίων *om. J¹SE* 4 πίνον *GVkd¹zΘE* 6 ἀμίδας] ἀμηνίαν
Φ|| τοιαῦται *GVkd¹vRyZ*

25C Favorinus Arelatensis, *Corinthiaca* 41 (F 95 p. 311.16–20
Barigazzi)

οἶδα δ' ἐγὼ καὶ Ἀρμόδιον καὶ Ἀριστογείτονα δου-
λεύσαντας ἐν Πέρσiais καὶ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως
πεντακοσίους ἀνδριάντας καὶ χιλίους ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων
μιᾷ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ πάντας καθηρημένους. ἐτόλ-
μησαν δὲ καὶ Φιλίππου τοῦ βασιλέως ἀμίδας κατα- 5
σκεδάσαι.

1–6 = [*D. Chr.*], *Or.* 37.41 (2.27.6–10 von Arnim); *de Oratione*
Corinthiaca (37) v. von Arnim 2.iii; Barigazzi 298–302 1–4
Overbeck no. 1441

ues)—the days of the year not yet exceeding this number—were erected, which however were pulled down soon afterwards.

¹ I.e., the erection of columns, symbolizing the elevation of the person honored above other mortals (as the triumphal arches later did).

25B Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 27 820E (BT 5.1.114.3–11 Hubert)

For honor should be awarded not in payment for the action performed but as a symbol, in order that it may also last a long time, as the honors mentioned earlier have lasted.¹ Of the three hundred statues of Demetrius of Phalerum not one became rusty or dirty; rather all were pulled down in his lifetime. And those of Demades were melted down to make chamber-pots.² Many such honors have also fared no better, because people became disgusted with them not only through the badness of the recipient but also through the greatness of the gift.

¹ Plutarch's point is that those who really have the interest of the state at heart, should be content with an inscription or honorary decree, and not desire a statue.

² Together with Phocion Demades was at the head of affairs in Athens after 322. In 319 he was sent on an embassy to Antipater, but was executed by Cassander on a charge of treason (Plu. *Dem.* 31.4–6; *Phoc.* 30; D.S. 18.48.1–4). He may have been confused with Demetrius of Phalerum in Plutarch's sources.

25C Favorinus of Arelate, *Corinthian Oration* 41 (F 95 p. 311.16–20 Barigazzi)

I know that even Harmodius and Aristogiton have been slaves amongst the Persians,¹ and that fifteen hundred statues of Demetrius of Phalerum have all been pulled down by the Athenians on one and the same day. They even dared to empty chamber-pots on Philip the king.²

¹ In 480 Xerxes took away the statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton; later Antiochus returned them (Paus. 1.8.5; Arr. *An.* 7.19.2; Val. Max. 2.10 ext. 1).

² Nothing is otherwise known about Philip's statue.

Deiectio a. 307

cf. 1.34–6; 2.11; 17.9–10; 19.14–15; 20B.2–3; 23E.6–8; 32.1–2; 35.7; 36.11; 39

- 26** *Marmor Parium* B 24–5, Ep. 20 (239 FGrH II B 1004.13–15 Jacoby)

47 W ἄφ' οὗ Δημήτριος ὁ Ἀντιγόνου τὸ[μ | Π]ειραιᾶ πολιορκήσας ἔλαβεν, [καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐξέπεσεν Ἀθηνῶν, ἔτη ΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντος] Ἀθήνησι Καιρίμου.

1–3 Jacoby MP 23; 131; 201–2; 228 T 4b FGrH; cf. 20A, 23A 2
ἐξέπεσεν] cf. 30.26; 32.2

2 Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐξέπεσεν Ἀθηνῶν Jacoby: Δ. ὁ Φ. Ἀθήνας παρέδωκεν vel εἰς Θήβας ἔφυγεν Wilhelm, AM 22 (1897) 210

- *27** *Suda*, s.v. Δημήτριος ὁ Ἀντιγόνου (no. 431, LG 1.2.41.23–8 Adler)

καὶ ὁ Μακεδονικὸς ἄρχων οὐ διὰ σχολαιότητος ἀφικνεῖται καὶ τήν τε Μουνυχίασιν οὖσαν φρουρὰν ἐκβάλλει καὶ Διονύσιον, τὸν ἐπιτεταγμένον αὐτῇ, κτείνει καὶ Δημήτριον τὸν Φαληρεᾶ μεθίστησιν, ὃς δὴ τὰ Ἀθήνησιν ἦγεν εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν, καὶ αὐτονομεῖσθαι, 5 καθότι πάτριον, Ἀθηναίοις τε καὶ Μεγαρεῦσιν ἔδωκεν, φυλάττειν τε ὅσα ἦν σφίσι ἐκ τῆς εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον πολιτείας νόμιμα.

2 Μουνυχίασιν] cf. *Marmor Parium* 239 FGrH B 25–6 Ep. 21 (a. 307/6) 5 εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν] cf. 18.3–5; 23E.7

2 Μουνυχίασιν in add. Bhd.: Μουνυχία A: Μουνυχίαν rel. 7 τῆς A: τοῦ GITM 8 νόμιμα AM: νόμιμον GI

- 28** Polyaeus, *Strategemata* 4.7.6 (BT 201.1–16 Woelfflin & Melber)

48 W Δημήτριος τοῦ Πειραιῶς ἐκράτησεν οὐχὶ παντὶ τῷ

Downfall 307 B.C.

cp. 1.34–6; 2.11; 17.9–10; 19.14–15; 20B.2–3; 23E.6–8; 32.1–2; 35.7; 36.11; 39

- 26** *Marmor Parium* B 24–5, Ep. 20 (239 *FGrH* II B 1004.13–15 Jacoby)

(There are) 44 years (to the present¹) from the time when Demetrius, the son of Antigonus,² took the Piraeus by siege and Demetrius of Phalerum was expelled from Athens,³ (in the year when) Caerimus was archon at Athens.⁴

¹ Cp. 20A note 1.

² Demetrius Poliorcetes, son of Antigonus Monophthalmus.

³ The supplement in the text about Demetrius of Phalerum in l. 2 is quite probable, because the explicit specification of Demetrius as “the son of Antigonus” in l. 1 presupposes the mention of a different Demetrius in l. 2; see Jacoby *MP* 131.

⁴ I.e., 308/7. Cp. notes 1 to 29 and 30.

- *27** *Suda*, under *Demetrius son of Antigonus* (no. 431, *LG* 1.2.41.23–8 Adler)

And the Macedonian leader (Demetrius Poliorcetes) arrived with all speed and threw out the garrison which was in Munychia¹ and killed Dionysius, the man who had been put in command of it,² and removed Demetrius of Phalerum, who turned the Athenian constitution into an oligarchy, and gave autonomy, as of old, to the Athenians and Megarians,³ and (allowed them) to retain all institutions intrinsic to their constitution of former times.

¹ This entry opens with a statement that Demetrius and Ptolemy both tried to be the first to liberate Greece from Cassander. It ignores the taking of the Piraeus which preceded that of Munychia, according to D.S. 20.45 (= 30).

² Dionysius was already there in 313; see 21.5–6.

³ Cp. D.S. 20.46.1 and 3.

- 28** Polyaeus, *Military Stratagems* 4.7.6 (*BT* 201.1–16 Woelfflin & Melber)

Demetrius (Poliorcetes) did not get the Piraeus in his power by

ναυτικῶ κατάρας, ἀλλὰ τὰς μὲν πλείστας τριήρεις ὑπὸ
 τῷ Σουνίῳ ναυλοχεῖν κελεύσας, εἴκοσι δὲ τὰς ἄριστα
 πλεούσας ἐπιλεξάμενος προσέταξε ῥοθίῳ τῇ εἰρεσίᾳ
 πλεῖν οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄστυ, ἀλλ' ὥς ἐπὶ τὴν Σαλαμῖνα. 5
 Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς, Ἀθηναίων στρατηγῶν, ἐτύγχανε
 μὲν κασανδρίζων· ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως κατιδὼν τὰς
 εἴκοσι νέας ἐπὶ Σαλαμῖνος πλεούσας, ἐνόμισεν εἶναι
 Πτολεμαϊκὰς ἐπὶ Κορίνθου πορευομένας. οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν
 εἴκοσι ἐπιστρέψαντες εὐθὺ τοῦ Πειραιῶς κατέσχον, 10
 παραχρῆμα δὲ καὶ Σουνιόθεν ὁ στόλος ἅπας ἐπικατή-
 γετο· ὥστε πολὺ πλῆθος ἐκβάντες κατελάβοντο τοὺς
 πύργους καὶ τὸν λιμένα. κήρυκες δὲ ἀνεβόων·
 “Δημήτριος τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐλευθεροῖ” καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸ
 κήρυγμα τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἰερώμενοι† Δημήτριον προσ- 15
 εδέξαντο.

1–16 228 *T 4b FGrH* 6 στρατηγῶν] *cf. ad 16B.11* 7
 κασανδρίζων] *cf. 30.12; ad 16A.15–17*

1 παντὶ *in P rec. manu ex* πάντων *corr.*: πάντων *F vulg.* 3 ἀρίστας
F 9 Πτολεμαϊκὰς *Woelfflin coll. 29.8*: πολεμικὰς *F vulg.* 10
 εὐθὺ *FV*: εὐθὺς *vulg.* 15 ἐρώμενοι *FV*: ὀρώμενοι *vulg. Woelfflin*
coll. 5.2.5: ἀκροώμενοι *Hertlein, JClPh 7 (1861) 253* || Δημήτριον οὐ
 προσεδέξαντο *F*

29

Plutarchus, *Demetrius* 8.4–9.3 (BT 3.1.9.5–10.9 Ziegler)

49 W

4 ἔπλει δὲ Δημήτριος ἔχων ἀργυρίου πεντακισχίλια
 τάλαντα καὶ στόλον νεῶν πεντήκοντα καὶ διακοσίων ἐπὶ
 τὰς Ἀθήνας, τὸ μὲν ἄστυ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως
 Κασάνδρῳ διοικοῦντος, ἐν δὲ τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ φρουρᾶς
 5 καθεστῶσης. εὐτυχία δ' ἅμα καὶ προνοία χρησάμενος 5
 ἐπεφαίνετο τῷ Πειραιεῖ πέμπτῃ φθίνοντος Θαρρηλιῶνος,
 προαισθομένου μὲν οὐδενός, ἐπεὶ δ' ὥφθη πλησίον ὁ
 στόλος, ἀπάντων ὥς Πτολεμαϊκὰς τὰς ναῦς ὑποδέχεσθαι
 παρασκευαζομένων, ὃς ἐσυμφρονήσαντες ἐβοήθουν οἱ
 στρατηγοί, καὶ θόρυβος ἦν οἶον εἰκὸς ἐν ἀπροσδοκῇ 10
 πολεμίους ἀποβαίνοντας ἀναγκαζομένων ἀμύνεσθαι.
 6 τοῖς γὰρ στόμασι τῶν λιμένων ἀκλείστοις ἐπιτυχῶν ὁ
 Δημήτριος καὶ διεξελάσας, ἐντὸς ἧν ἤδη καταφανῆς
 πᾶσι, καὶ διεσήμηνεν ἀπὸ τῆς νεῶς αἵτησιν ἡσυχίας καὶ

swooping down on it with the whole of his fleet. Instead he ordered most of his triremes to lie in wait at the foot of Cape Sunium, and selecting the twenty fastest ones he ordered them to row at full speed, not to the city but ostensibly in the direction of Salamis. Demetrius of Phalerum, who was general of the Athenians, happened to be on Cassander's side. Seeing from the Acropolis the twenty ships sailing in the direction of Salamis, he thought they were Ptolemy's ships proceeding towards Corinth.¹ But the men on the twenty ships made a turn and straight away bore down on the Piraeus, while the whole (main body of the) fleet as well immediately came sailing down from Cape Sunium. As a result they landed in great numbers and took the strongholds and the port. Heralds announced loudly, "Demetrius is setting Athens free". And the Athenians, †...† the announcement of freedom, welcomed Demetrius.

¹ In 308 Ptolemy had taken Sicyon and Corinth in his campaign of liberating Greece, but when the Peloponnesians did not cooperate, he made peace with Cassander and leaving a garrison in Sicyon and Corinth departed for Egypt (D.S. 20.37.1–2).

29 Plutarch, *Demetrius* 8.4–9.3 (BT 3.1.9.5–10.9 Ziegler)

- 4 Demetrius (Poliorcetes) sailed against Athens with 5,000 talents in silver money and a fleet of 250 ships. Demetrius of
 5 Phalerum was administering the city for Cassander, and a garrison was stationed on Munychia. Through sheer luck and planning as well, he appeared outside the Piraeus on the 26th of Thargelion,¹ without anyone having seen (him coming). As soon as the fleet was seen to be near, all prepared to welcome the ships thinking they belonged to Ptolemy.² Too late the generals perceived their mistake and came to the rescue; the confusion was great, as is likely to occur when unexpectedly men are compelled
 6 to defend themselves against an enemy landing. For Demetrius (Poliorcetes) had found that the entrances to the harbours were not closed and had sailed through; already inside and visible to all, he made a signal from his ship to demand quiet and silence.

- 7 σιωπῆς. γενομένου δὲ τούτου κήρυκα παραστησάμενος 15
 ἀνεῖπεν, ὅτι πέμψειεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ, Ἀθη-
 ναίους ἐλευθερώσοντα καὶ τὴν φρουρὰν ἐκβαλοῦντα
 51 W καὶ τοὺς νόμους αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν πατριὸν ἀποδώσοντα
 πολιτείαν.
- 9 ἀναρρηθέντων δὲ τούτων οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ παραχρῆμα 20
 τὰς ἀσπίδας θέμενοι πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν ἀνεκρότησαν, καὶ
 βοῶντες ἐκέλευον ἀποβαίνειν τὸν Δημήτριον, εὐεργέτην
 2 καὶ σωτῆρα προσαγορεύοντες· οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Φαληρέα
 πάντως μὲν ὄντο δεῖν δέχεσθαι τὸν κρατοῦντα, κἄν
 μηδὲν ὧν ἐπαγγέλλεται μέλλῃ βεβαιοῦν, ὅμως δὲ πρέσ- 25
 βεις δεομένους ἀπέστειλαν, οἷς ὁ Δημήτριος ἐντυχὼν
 φιλανθρώπως συνέπεμψε παρ' ἑαυτοῦ τῶν πατρώων
 3 φίλων τὸν Μιλήσιον Ἀριστόδημον. τοῦ δὲ Φαληρέως
 διὰ τὴν μεταβολὴν τῆς πολιτείας μᾶλλον τοὺς πολίτας
 ἢ τοὺς πολεμίους δεδοικότος οὐκ ἡμέλησεν ὁ Δημήτριος, 30
 ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν δόξαν αἰδεσθεὶς καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν τοῦ ἀνδ-
 ρός, εἰς Θήβας αὐτὸν ὥσπερ ἐβούλετο μετ' ἀσφαλείας
 συνεξέπεμψεν.

1–33 228 T 4b FGrH 4 διοικοῦντος] cf. 16A.15 || φρουρᾶς] cf.
 16A.12–13; 30.7 30 δεδοικότος] cf. 1.34–5 31 τὴν δόξαν] cf.
 2.9; 17.8 || τὴν ἀρετὴν] v. ad 16A.18–19 32 εἰς Θήβας] cf. 30.24;
 32.2

5 δ'] τὲ r 7 μὲν οὐδενός] μηδενός P 9 παρασκευαζομένων. ὡς
 <δὲ> Ziegler 10 εἰκὸς om. r 16 <τοὺς> Ἀθηναίους Sintenis seq.
 Ziegler 20 παραχρῆμα om. PK 22 ἐκέλευον] ἀνεκέλευον
 K 22–3 εὐεργέτην—προσαγορεύοντες] καὶ σ. καὶ εὐ. ἀναγορεύ-
 οντες r 24 πάντως Anon.: πάντες codd. 25 μηδὲν] οὐδὲν r ||
 ἐπαγγέλλεται] -έλλεται P 27 πατρώων] πρώτων r 30 δε-
 δοικότος] φοβουμένου r

30 Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* 20.45.1–5 (BT 5.239.3–6; 239.9–240.7 Fischer)

- 1 τοῦ δ' ἐνιαυσίου χρόνου διεληλυθότος Ἀθήνησι μὲν
 ἦρχεν Ἀναξικράτης, ἐν Ῥώμῃ δὲ ὑπατοὶ κατέστησαν
 Ἄππιος Κλαύδιος καὶ Λεύκιος Οὐολόμνιος. ἐπὶ δὲ
 τούτων Δημήτριος μὲν ὁ Ἀντιγόνου ... ἐξέπλευσεν ἐκ
 50 W τῆς Ἐφέσου· παράγγελμα δ' εἶχεν ἐλευθεροῦν πάσας 5

7 When that had been effected, he placed a herald beside him and announced that his father³ had sent him (intending to promote) their good fortune: he was to liberate the Athenians, throw out the garrison and give them back their laws and the constitution of their fathers.

9 At this announcement most (of the Athenians) at once placed their shields at their feet and applauded loudly; with loud cheers they called upon Demetrius to disembark, addressing him as
2 benefactor and saviour. The party of the Phalerean believed they had to accept the conqueror in any event, even if he would not keep any of his promises. Nevertheless they despatched envoys pleading their cause. Demetrius met them in a friendly manner and sent back with them as his representative Aristodemus of
3 Miletus,⁴ one of the friends of his father's family. Because of the change in government the Phalerean was more afraid of his fellow citizens than of the enemies; Demetrius (Poliorketes) took his situation to heart, and out of respect for both his reputation and his virtue, helped him to get away to Thebes in safety as he wished.⁵

¹ Thargelion corresponds to May/June.

² Ptolemy had made peace with Cassander (note 1 to 28); so these ships would have belonged to allies of the Athenians.

³ Antigonos Monophthalmus; cp. note 2 to 30.

⁴ A trusted friend and helper of Antigonos.

⁵ In Plutarch's account (9.4–10.1) Demetrius after this first attacked Megara and threw out Cassander's garrison; then he did the same with Munychia (cp. 31); after that he assembled the Athenian people and officially restored democracy. The over-enthusiastic manner in which the Athenians reacted, elicits from Plutarch the comment cited in 18.

30 Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History* 20.45.1–5 (BT 5.239.3–6; 239.9–240.7 Fischer)

1 After the year had ended, Anaxicrates was the eponymous archon in Athens and Appius Claudius and Lucius Volumnius became consuls in Rome.¹ During the period of their office, Demetrius (Poliorketes), the son of Antigonos, ... set sail from Ephesus. He had orders to liberate all the cities throughout Hellas,

- μὲν τὰς κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πόλεις, πρώτην δὲ τὴν
 2 Ἀθηναίων, φρουρουμένην ὑπὸ Κασάνδρου. καταπλεύ-
 σαντος δ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ
 πανταχόθεν προσβαλόντος ἐξ ἐφόδου καὶ κήρυγμα
 ποιησαμένου Διονύσιος ὁ καθεσταμένος ἐπὶ τῆς 10
 Μουνυχίας φρούραρχος καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς
 ἐπιμελητὴς τῆς πόλεως γεγεννημένος ὑπὸ Κασάνδρου,
 πολλοὺς ἔχοντες στρατιώτας, ἀπὸ τῶν τειχῶν ἡμύνοντο.
 3 τῶν δ' Ἀντιγόνου στρατιωτῶν τινες βιασάμενοι καὶ
 κατὰ τὴν ἀκτὴν ὑπερβάντες ἐντὸς τοῦ τείχους παρ- 15
 εδέξαντο πλείους τῶν συναγωνιζομένων.

- τὸν μὲν οὖν Πειραιᾶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἀλῶναι
 συνέβη, τῶν δ' ἔνδον Διονύσιος μὲν ὁ φρούραρχος εἰς
 τὴν Μουνυχίαν συνέφυγε, Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Φαληρεὺς
 4 ἀπεχώρησεν εἰς ἄστυ. τῇ δ' ὕστεραία πεμφθεὶς μεθ' 20
 ἑτέρων πρεσβευτῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου πρὸς Δημήτριον καὶ
 περὶ τῆς αὐτονομίας διαλεχθεὶς καὶ τῆς ἰδίας ἀσφαλείας
 ἔτυχε παραπομπῆς καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀπο-
 γινώσκων ἔφυγεν εἰς τὰς Θήβας, ὕστερον δὲ πρὸς
 5 Πτολεμαῖον εἰς Αἴγυπτον. οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἔτη δέκα τῆς 25
 πόλεως ἐπιστατήσας ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος τὸν
 εἰρημένον τρόπον. ὁ δὲ δῆμος τῶν Ἀθηναίων κομισά-
 μενος τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἐψηφίσατο τιμὰς τοῖς αἰτίοις τῆς
 αὐτονομίας.

2 Ἀναξικράτους] cf. 23E.6–7; 31.3–4 7 φρουρουμένην] cf.
 16A.12–13; 29.3 11–12 Δημήτριος—Κασάνδρου] v. ad 16A.15–
 17 12 ἐπιμελητῆς] cf. 16A.16 18–25 228 T 4a FGrH 22
 περὶ τῆς αὐτονομίας] cf. 27.5 24 Θήβας] cf. 29.32; 32.2 25 ἔτη
 δέκα] v. ad 1.4 26 ἐπιστατήσας] cf. 19.8; 22.6 || ἐξέπεσεν] cf. 26.2;
 32.2

9 κηρύγματα F 22 περὶ] ὑπὲρ F || καὶ τῆς ἰδίας] καὶ περὶ τῆς ιδ. F
 23 παραπομπῆς] παραφυλακῆς F || τὰ κατὰ om. X

31 Philochorus ap. Dionysium Halicarnassensem, *De Dinarcho* 3.4–5 (CB 5.126.11–22 Aujaç)

56 W

Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικάῃς ἱστορίαις περὶ τε τῆς
 φυγῆς τῶν καταλυσάντων τὸν δῆμον καὶ περὶ τῆς
 καθόδου πάλιν οὕτως λέγει· “τοῦ γὰρ Ἀναξικράτους

and first that of the Athenians, which was being held by a garrison
 2 of Cassander's. He sailed with his naval force into the Piraeus,
 made an immediate attack on all sides and issued a proclamation;
 but Dionysius, who was the commander of the garrison on
 Munychia, and Demetrius of Phalerum, who had been made over-
 seer of the city by Cassander, had many soldiers and defended
 3 themselves from the walls. But some of Antigonos' soldiers
 forced their way through along the coast and climbed the wall.²
 Once within they admitted more of their fellow soldiers.

In that way it came to pass that the Piraeus was captured. Of
 those inside, Dionysius, the commander of the garrison, took ref-
 uge in Munychia; Demetrius of Phalerum withdrew into the city.
 4 The following day he, together with some others, was sent by the
 people as ambassador to Demetrius (Polioretes). After discuss-
 ing with Demetrius the autonomy (of the city) and his personal
 safety, he obtained a safe-conduct, and giving up his position in
 5 Athens he fled to Thebes, and afterwards to Ptolemy in Egypt.³ In
 this manner, after having been at the head of the government of
 the city for a period of ten years, he was expelled from his coun-
 try. The people of the Athenians thus got back their freedom and
 voted honorary awards to those responsible for (recovering) the
 autonomy.⁴

¹ I.e., 307/6. The Roman consuls were Ap. Claudius C. f. Ap. n. Caecus and L. Volumnius C. f. C. n. Flamma Violens.

² Demetrius had been equipped by his father Antigonos with a large expedi-
 tionary force (D.S. 20.45.1) .

³ Ptolemy I Soter. .

⁴ Cp. Plu. *Demetr.* 10.2. In Diodorus' account, Demetrius attacked Munychia
 next and captured it after two days (20.45.5–7). After that 'liberty' was offi-
 cially restored to the Athenians, and then Demetrius took Megara (46.1–3). For
 the discrepancies between Plutarch (29) and Diodorus (30), see Jacoby *FGrH*
 III b Suppl. I 341–5 on Philochorus 328 F 66.

31 Philochorus in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Dinarchus* 3.4–5 (CB 5.126.11–22 Aujac)

In the *History of Attica* Philochorus says the following about
 the exile of the men who brought down the democracy¹ and about
 their return again: "Straightway at the beginning of the year that

ἄρχοντας, εὐθὺ μὲν ἢ τῶν Μεγαρέων πόλις ἐάλω· ὁ δὲ
 Δημήτριος [ὁ] κατελθὼν ἐκ τῶν Μεγάρων κατ- 5
 εσκευάζετο τὰ πρὸς τὴν Μουνυχίαν καὶ τὰ τεῖχη
 κατασκάψας ἀπέδωκε τῷ δήμῳ. ὕστερον δὲ εἰσηγ-
 γέλθησαν πολλοὶ (τῶν) πολιτῶν, ἐν οἷς καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ
 Φαληρεὺς. τῶν δ' εἰσαγγελθέντων οὓς μὲν οὐχ ὑπο-
 μείναντας τὴν κρίσιν ἐνεθανάτωσαν τῇ ψήφῳ, οὓς δ' 10
 5 ὑπακούσαντας ἀπέλυσαν." ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τῆς ὀγδόης.

1-11 228 T 4b FGrH = Philoch. 328 F 66 FGrH (cf. III b Suppl. I 340-5)
 3 Ἀναξικράτους] cf. 23E.6-7; 30.1-2 9-10 τῶν δ'—ψήφῳ]
 cf. 1.24-5; 23E.8

2 φυγῆς τῶν καταλυσάντων Sylburg coll. D.H. Din. 2.5: αὐτῆς τῶν
 καλεσάντων F 5 ὁ del. Wilhelm 8 τῶν add. Krueger 10
 ἐθανάτωσαν Krueger seq. Aujac 11 τῆς ὀγδόης] (ἐκ) τῆς ὀγ.
 Marengi seq. Aujac

Exilium

cf. 1.34-6; 2.11; 19.14-15; 20B.3; 23E.6-8; 35.6-7; 36.11;
 39

32 Plutarchus, *Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur* 28
 69C-D (BT 1.138.18-139.1 Gärtner)

59 W λέγεται δὲ καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ὅτε τῆς
 πατρίδος ἐξέπεσε καὶ περὶ Θήβας ἀδοξῶν καὶ ταπεινὰ
 πράττων διῆγεν, οὐχ ἡδέως ἰδεῖν προσιόντα Κράτητα,
 παρρησίαν κυνικὴν καὶ λόγους τραχεῖς προσδεχόμενος·
 ἐντυχόντος δὲ πρῶως αὐτῷ τοῦ Κράτητος καὶ δια- 5
 λεχθέντος περὶ φυγῆς ὡς οὐδὲν ἔχοι κακὸν οὐδ' ἄξιον
 φέρειν βαρέως πραγμάτων σφαλερῶν καὶ ἀβεβαίων
 D ἀπηλλαγμένον, ἅμα δὲ θαρρεῖν ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῇ
 διαθέσει παρακαλοῦντος, ἡδίων γενόμενος καὶ ἀναθαρ-
 ρήσας πρὸς τοὺς φίλους εἶπε "φεῦ τῶν πράξεων ἐκείνων 10
 καὶ ἀσχολιῶν δι' ἃς ἄνδρα τοιοῦτον οὐκ ἔγνωμεν."
 λυπούμενῳ γὰρ μῦθος εὐμενῆς φίλων,
 ἄγαν δὲ μωραίνοντι νοουθήματα.

Anaxicrates was archon,² the city of the Megareans was taken. Demetrius (Poliorcetes) came back from Megara and started operations against Munychia. He razed its walls to the ground and restored it to the people.³ Later many of the citizens were impeached, and among them there was also Demetrius of Phalerum. Of those impeached some did not await the verdict of their trial and were condemned to death by vote; others submitted and were
 5 set free.” This is from the eighth book.⁴

¹ I.e., “the partisans of Demetrios of Phaleron whom he [D.H.] calls comprehensively and quite correctly οἱ καταλύσαντες τὸν δῆμον” Jacoby *FGrH* III b Suppl. I 340.

² I.e., 307/6.

³ On the sequence of events, cp. note 5 to 29 and note 4 to 30.

⁴ Despite the use of quotation marks, it is doubtful that the words accurately represent what Philochorus wrote. See von Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 34 (1899) 624 [KS IV 95]; Jacoby *FGrH* III b Suppl. I 341.

Exile

cp. 1.34–6; 2.11; 19.14–15; 20B.3; 23E.6–8; 35.6–7; 36.11; 39

- 32 Plutarch, *How to tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 28 69C–D (BT 1.138.18–139.1 Gärtner)

Of Demetrius of Phalerum too¹ it is said that when he was banished from his country and living near Thebes in obscurity and humble circumstances, he was not happy to see Crates approach him; for he expected cynical outspokenness and harsh words from him. Crates, however, met him in a friendly way and talked with him about exile, (saying) that there was no harm in it and it was not worth being troubled about, because it meant being freed from
 D perilous and unstable conditions. At the same time he exhorted him to have confidence in himself and his own disposition. Demetrius’ mood changed for the better; he took courage and said to his friends “How I regret those affairs and demands which kept us from getting to know such a man!”

For when in distress, one needs a kindly word from friends; when making too much of a fool of oneself, their admonitions.

οὗτος ὁ τρόπος τῶν γενναίων φίλων·

1–11 *Crates Thebanus* V H 34 SSR II 536 Giannantoni 1–3 228 T 5 FGrH 2 ἐξέπεσε] cf. 26.2; 30.26 || περὶ Θήβας] cf. 29.32; 30.24 12–13 *Eur. F* 962,2–3 N.² = F 1380 Mette, *Lustrum* 13 (1968) 325; cf. *Sotion ap. Stob.* 4 48b.30; *Plu. Cons. ad Apol.* 1 102B

6 ἔχει ΠNhD 7 ἀβεβαίων ΓΚ: βαρέων hSD: βιαίων O 8 ἀπηλλαγμένος *Larsen* || ἐφ' om. SD, *Bernardakis* 12 γὰρ] μὲν *Stob. et Plu. Mor.* 102B || φίλωι G¹: φίλου *Stob.*

33A Sosicrates ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae* 10.19 422C–D (BT 2.418.19–22 Kaibel)

58b W D καὶ Κράτης δ' ὁ κυνικός, ὥς φησι Σωσικράτης ἐν ταῖς Διαδοχαῖς, ἐπερράπισε Δημήτριον τὸν Φαληρέα σὺν τῇ πῆρᾳ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ λάγυνον πέμψαντα οἴνου· “εἴθε γάρ, ἔφη, τὰς κρήνας καὶ ἄρτους ἦν φέρειν.”

1–4 *Ath. Epit.* (2.2.30.3–5 Peppink); *Sosicrates Rhodius F* 13 *Giannattasio Andria* = *Crates Thebanus* V H 33 SSR II 536 Giannantoni

33B Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 6.90 (OCT 2.287.24–6 Long)

58a W Δημήτριον τὸν Φαληρέα πέμψαντα αὐτῷ ἄρτους καὶ οἶνον ὠνείδισεν εἰπών, “εἴθε γὰρ αἱ κρήναι καὶ ἄρτους ἔφερον.” δῆλον οὖν ὡς ὕδωρ ἔπινεν.

1–3 *Crates Thebanus* V H 33 SSR II 536 Giannantoni

***34** Ioannes Tzetzes, *Historiae* 4.740; 747–8 (155 Leone)

ὦ τῶν στροφῶν τῆς τύχης.

... ..

‘Ο Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος μέγας καὶ τιμητέος,
ἀλλ’ ὕστερον εἰς Κόρινθον ἀτίμως γραμματεύει.

Such is the way of true friends.

¹ Plutarch has just used the example of small children, who in falling hurt themselves, and are picked up and soothed by their nurses, only to be scolded afterwards.

- 33A** Sosicrates in Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 10.19 422C–D (BT 2.418.19–22 Kaibel)

According to Sosicrates in his *Successions*, Crates, the Cynic,
D too severely rebuked Demetrius of Phalerum for sending him together with a bag of loaves of bread also a flask of wine. He said “I wish it were possible for the springs to bring forth loaves of bread as well.”¹

¹ In the preceding quotation from Diphilus’ *Parasite* (422B–C) the expressions “bag of loaves” and “flask of wine” are also used.

- 33B** Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 6.90 (OCT 2.287.24–6 Long)

When Demetrius of Phalerum sent him (Crates) loaves of bread and wine, he (Crates) chided him saying “I wish the springs brought forth loaves of bread as well.” Clearly, his beverage was usually water.¹

¹ This saying of Crates is followed by one concerning Theophrastus (= no. 23 FHS&G).

- *34** Joannes Tzetzes, *Histories* 4.740; 747–8 (155 Leone)

Ah, the changes of fortune! (...¹) The Phalerean Demetrius was a great man and worthy of honor, but later he (went) to Corinth to work (there) without honor as a secretarial hack.

¹ As further instances Tzetzes names Hannibal, Themistocles and Eumenes.

Refugium in Aegypto

cf. 1.34–44; 74; 2.11–14; 19.14–15; 20B.3; 42; 58A–66

- 35 Plutarchus, *De exilio* 7 601F–602A (BT 3.518.11–21 Paton et al.)

61 W πλοῦτον μὲν γὰρ ἀποβαλόντα ῥαδίως οὐκ ἔστι καὶ
ταχέως ἄλλον συναγαγεῖν, πατρίς δὲ γίνεται πᾶσα πόλις
εὐθὺς ἀνθρώπῳ χρῆσθαι μεμαθηκότι καὶ ῥίζας ἔχοντι
πανταχοῦ ζῆν τε καὶ τρέφεσθαι καὶ παντὶ τόπῳ προσ-
φύεσθαι δυναμένας, οἷας εἶχε Θεμιστοκλῆς οἷας 5
Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς. οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ
μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν πρῶτος ὢν τῶν Πτολεμαίου φίλων οὐ
μόνον αὐτὸς ἐν ἀφθόνοις διῆγεν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναί-
602A οῖς δωρεὰς ἔπεμπε, Θεμιστοκλῆς δὲ χορηγία βασιλικῇ
πρυτανευόμενος εἰπεῖν λέγεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ 10
τοὺς παῖδας “ἀπωλόμεθ’ ἄν, εἰ μὴ ἀπωλόμεθα.”

1–3 *Stob.* 3.40.3.4 6–9 228 *T 6a FGrH* 7 μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν] cf.
19.14–15 || πρῶτος—φίλων] cf. 1.36–7; 51–3; 37; 38 11 *Teles*
22.14–23.1 et v. quae collegit *Nachstädt ad Plu. Reg. et imp.*
apophthegm. 17 185F

2 ἄλλον *Stob.*: om. *codd.* 4 τόπῳ *Ald.*²: τρόπῳ *codd.*

- 36 Cicero, *De Finibus* 5.19.53–4 (BT 13.182.22–183.11 Schiche)

53 ac veteres quidem philosophi in beatorum insulis fingunt
qualis futura sit vita sapientium, quos cura omni liberatos,
nullum necessarium vitae cultum aut paratum requirentis,
nihil aliud esse acturos putant, nisi ut omne tempus
inquirendo ac discendo in naturae cognitione consumant. 5
nos autem non solum beatae vitae istam esse oblectationem
62 W videmus, sed etiam levamentum miseriarum. itaque multi,
cum in potestate essent hostium aut tyrannorum, multi in
custodia, multi in exilio dolorem suum doctrinae studiis
54 levaverunt. princeps huius civitatis Phalereus Demetrius 10
cum patria pulsus esset iniuria, ad Ptolomaeum se regem
Alexandream contulit. qui cum in hac ipsa philosophia, ad

Refuge in Egypt

cf. 1.34–44; 74; 2.11–14; 19.14–15; 20B.3; 42; 58A–66

- 35 Plutarch, *On Exile* 7 601F–602A (BT 3.518.11–21 Paton *et al.*)

602A Having lost one's wealth one cannot amass another fortune easily and quickly. But any city becomes a person's homeland straight away if he knows how to make use (of it) and has roots that can live and find nourishment to grow on anywhere and strike in any place, such as Themistocles had, such as Demetrius of Phalerum had. For the latter lived in Alexandria after his exile, first amongst the friends of Ptolemy,¹ not only enjoying abundance himself, but even sending gifts to the Athenians.² And Themistocles, while being supported by the bounty of the (Persian) king,³ is reported to have spoken to his wife and children: "We would have been ruined, if we had not been ruined."

¹ Ptolemy I Soter, who reigned 306/4–283/2.

² Possibly in 287, when Athens was liberated from Demetrius Poliorcetes, with the support of Ptolemy.

³ Xerxes I (cp., e.g., Thuc. 1.138.5).

- 36 Cicero, *On Ends* 5.19.53–4 (BT 13.182.22–183.11 Schiche)

53 And the old philosophers do indeed picture to themselves the sort of life the wise men will have in the islands of the blessed: these, they think, will be freed from all sorrow; they will not require any tending to or provision of the necessities of life, and will do nothing but spend all their time in doing research and acquiring knowledge in the study of nature. We, however, realize that there is not only this delight inherent in the blessed life, but also a way of alleviating one's misery. That's why many, when they are in the power of enemies or tyrants, many when in prison, many when in exile, have alleviated their sorrow by learned studies. The leader of this state.¹ Demetrius of Phalerum, when he had
54 been unjustly expelled from his country, went to King Ptolemy in Alexandria. Since he excelled in this very philosophy which we

quam te hortamur, excelleret Theophrastique esset auditor,
 multa praeclara in illo calamitoso otio scripsit non ad usum
 aliquem suum, quo erat orbatus, sed animi cultus ille erat ei 15
 quasi quidam humanitatis cibus.

10–16 228 *T 7 FGrH* 10 princeps—civitatis] v. *ad 16A.15–17*
 12–16 v. *sub 'Iudicia'* 13 *Thphr. no. 18.5 FHS&G*; v. 8

2 futura *Leclerc*: natura *codd.* 5 inq̄rendo *E*: in querendo *RV*:
 inquerendo *N* 12 ipsa *om. BE* 14 scripsit *ed. Veneta 1494*: scribit
codd.

37 Philodemus, *De rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 101, 6–16 (BT
 1.377–8 Sudhaus)

60 W καὶ συνανα[στ]ρεφο-
 μένους ἐ[λ]εοῦσιν, οὐ μό-
 νον θαυμάζουσι, καὶ
 δῆμων μᾶλλον, ὥς Πύ-
 10 θωνα Φίλιππος καὶ τὸν
 Φαληρέα Δημήτριον
 Πτολεμαῖος καὶ πολλοὶ
 πλείονας [ᾗ]λλους καὶ ἄ-
 ριστοκρα[τί]αι καὶ συν-
 15 εδρίαι, πο[λ]λὰ παρεδέ-
 ξ]ατο τῶν [ῥ]ητόρων τι ...

ante haec verba habet pap. 2–5 αἱ ὁ ῥ[ήτωρ] ? | — ρο. [καὶ διὰ] τὰς
 ὁμοίας ἄ]ρετὰς [χαί]εντα[ς πολ]λ[ο]ῦ[ς δυνά]σταῖ *Sudhaus* 6–
 16 *Sudhaus*

38 Plutarchus, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* 189D
 (BT 2.54.12–16 Nachstädt et al.)

ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ Ο ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ

63 W Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ
 παρήνει τὰ περὶ βασιλείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας βιβλία
 κτᾶσθαι καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν· “ἂ γὰρ οἱ φίλοι τοῖς βασι-

urge you² to pursue, and (since) he was a student of Theophrastus,³ he wrote many excellent things in that miserable retirement, not for any practical use of his own, for he was debarred from affairs; no, this cultivation of the mind was to him as it were a sustenance of his humanity.

¹ The dialogue is here set in the Academy at Athens, with M. Pupius Piso expounding the Peripatetic theory.

² Cicero.

³ Ptolemy had had relations with Theophrastus too (D.L. 5.37 = Thphr. no. 1 FHS&G).

- 37** Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 101, 6–16 (*BT* 1.377–8 Sudhaus)

...and show mercy on ...living with them, not only admire (them), even more than democracies, as Philip (did) with Python¹ and Ptolemy with Demetrius of Phalerum and many (did) with many others both aristocracies and councils, often accepted something from the orators ...

¹ This could be either Python of Aenus, who served Philip II, king of Macedonia (Dem. 23.127), or Python of Byzantium, a pupil of Isocrates, who was sent by the same on an embassy to Athens in 343 (Dem. 18.136). Cp. Dorandi in this volume.

- 38** Plutarch, *Sayings of Kings and Commanders* 189D (*BT* 2.54.12–16 Nachstädt *et al.*)

DEMETRIUS OF PHALERUM

Demetrius of Phalerum advised King Ptolemy to acquire the books dealing with kingship and leadership, and to read them:

λεῦσιν οὐ θαρροῦσι παραινεῖν, ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις
γέγραπται.”

1–6 228 T 6b FGrH; Stob. 4.7.27 (4.255.10–14 Hense); App. Vat. I 49
(176.4–6 Sternbach), ubi ὁ αὐτὸς ad Democratem Parrhesiasten refert;
Mel. Aug. 29 (Bar. f. 191b); Ars. 188.18–22 Walz 2–3 Πτολεμαίῳ—
παρήνει] cf. 1.36–9; 51–3 4–6 ἃ γὰρ—γέγραπται] idem apo-
phthegma Demetrio attribuitur in Max. 16 (PG 91.817.22–4 Combefis);
Corp. Par. 476; Apost. 1.27^d (CPG 2.246.13–14 Leutsch) →

39 Hieronymus, *Interpretatio Chronicorum Eusebii* ad Ol.
118,1–4 (GCS 24 [Eusebius 7] p. 127.3–6 Helm)

Alexandrinorum Consules		Syriae	Macedo- num	Asiae	a. Chr.
CXVIII Olymp					
64 W	XVII Demetrius Falereus ad	V	X	XI	308
MDCCX	XVIII Ptolomaeum ueniens impe-	VI	XI	XII	307
	XVIII trauit, ut Atheniensibus	VII	XII	XIII	306
	XX democratia redderetur	VIII	XIII	XIII	305

4–7 cf. Anon. Matr. 39.10–12 Bauer: Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς πρὸς
Πτολεμαῖον ἦλθεν, ὃς καὶ Ἀθηναίοις τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἀπέδωκε; cf.
20B et v. ad 19.10–11 →

40 Aelianus, *Varia historia* 3.17 (BT 46.26; 47.24–9 Dilts)

ἐπολιτεύσαντο οὖν καὶ φιλόσοφοι ... Δημήτριος δὲ ὁ
Φαληρεὺς καὶ Ἀθήνησιν ἐπιφανέστατα ἐπολιτεύσατο,
ἔστ' [ἄν] αὐτὸν ὁ συνήθης Ἀθηναίοις φθόνος ἐξέωσε·
καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ δὲ συνὼν τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ νομοθεσίας
ἦρξε. τίς δὲ ἀντιφῆσει καὶ Περικλέα τὸν Ξανθίππου 5
φιλόσοφον γενέσθαι ...;

1–5 228 T 6c FGrH 1 φιλόσοφοι] cf. ad 2.3 2 ἐπιφ. ἐπολιτεύσατο]
v. ad 16A.18–19 3 φθόνος] v. ad 1.22–4 4 νομοθεσίας] v. ad
20A.2

3 [ἄν] del. Hercher

*41 PLille 88 (CPF I 1** 42 1T, p. 3–4 Linguiti)

τὸν Καλλι]-
σθένη δὲ καὶ τὸν [Φα]-

“For the things their friends do not dare to offer to kings as advice, are written in these books.”¹

¹ In this compilation of sayings (spurious?), one dictum of Demetrius of Phalerum is quoted between five of Pisistratus and five of Lycurgus.

2 Δ. ὁ Φ.] Δ. Φανοστράτου Φ. *Ars.*: ὁ αὐτὸς *App. Vat.* || τῷ *om.* Σ

- 39** Hieronymus, *Translation of Eusebius' Chronological Canons* Ol. 118,1–4 (GCS 24 [Eusebius 7] p. 127.3–6 Helm)

Demetrius of Phalerum went to Ptolemy and obtained the restoration of democracy to the Athenians.¹

¹ The number MDCCX (1710) refers to the birth of Abraham. The entry is put in Olympiad 118, 308–305 B.C.; the other numbers refer to the reigns of Ptolemy I in Egypt; of Seleucus Nicanor in Syria; of Cassander in Macedonia; and of Antigonus in Asia.

ad CXVIII Ol. *L.*, *ad* XVIII A, *ad* XXII B 2 *inpetrauit* A: *inperabit* L: *impetravit ex imperavit* P 4 *democritia* A: *democratia* M

- 40** Aelian, *Miscellaneous History* 3.17 (BT 46.26; 47.24–9 Dilts)

As a matter of fact, philosophers too have participated in government ... Demetrius of Phalerum participated with the greatest distinction in government in Athens, until the customary envy of the Athenians drove him out; in Egypt too, where he was associated with Ptolemy, he was responsible for legislation. And who will deny that Pericles too, the son of Xanthippus, was a philosopher ...?¹

¹ Aelian lists a number of ‘philosophers’, who have either benefited their country or actively entered politics: Demetrius is preceded in this list by Zaleucus, Charondas, Archytas, Solon, Bias, Thales, Chilon, Pittacus, Cleobulus, Anaximander, Xenophon, Plato, Socrates, Aristotle.

- *41** *PLille* 88 (CPF I 1** 42 1T, p. 3–4 Linguiti)

Callisthenes and Demetrius of Phalerum did not derive any

ληρέα Δημήτρι[ον]
 οὐθὲν ὠφέλησεν [ή]
 5 περὶ τοὺς λόγους δ[ει]-
 νότης καὶ τὸ μεγ[α]-
 λοπρεπὲς τῶν φ[ρά-
 σ]έων, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν π[α-
 ρ'] Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δια-
 10 [β]ληθείς, ὁ δ' ἐναντ[ι]-
 .]. τῷ παροφθεντ.[
].....ε.υτ.[

1–11 *ed. C. Meillier, CRIPEL 5 (1979) 366–8; iterum ed. A. Linguiti, CPF 1 1**, p. 3–5; de Callisthene Demetrioque comparatis cf. 42.4–9* 9–10 *cf. 1.36–42; 51–3* →

Aspide occisus

42 Cicero, *Pro Rabirio Postumo* 9.23 (BT 25.60.16–61.1 Olechowska)

71 W virum unum totius Graeciae facile doctissimum, Platonem, iniquitate Dionysi Siciliae tyranni, cui se ille commiserat, in maximis periculis insidiisque esse versatum accepimus; Callisthenem doctum hominem comitem Magni Alexandri ab Alexandro necatum; Demetrium et ex 5 re publica, Athenis quam optime gesserat, et ex doctrina nobilem et clarum, qui Phalereus vocitatus est, in eodem isto Aegyptio regno aspide ad corpus admota vita esse privatum.

1–4 *Pl. Ep. 7; Plu. Dio 4–5; 10–16; 19–20* 4–5 *Callisthenes 124 T 19b FGrH; Arr. An. 4.14.3 = 124 T 8 FGrH; cf. 41* 5–9 *FGrH II b 643 ad 228 T 1* 6 *Athenis—gesserat] v. ad 16A.18–19* 7 *nobilem et clarum] v. ad 14.5* 8–9 *aspide—privatum] cf. 1.42–3; 2.12–13*

3 *insidiisque Carbo: insidiis mediisque V: mediisque in insidiis Halm* 6 *Athenis del. Madvig: Atheniensi Lambinus || quam suppl. V¹ || Athenis—gesserat del. Halm, Abh. Bay. Ak. W. 7.3 (1855) 660–1 || gesserat dett.: digesserat V* 7 *qui—est del. Halm 1855, 661* 8 *egyptio ex egypto V¹: phalerio dett.: Phario Turnebus*

benefit from their deft command of words and the splendor of their phrases; no, the former was slandered before Alexander, the latter ...¹

¹ The text is too damaged to admit of translation, but it appears to contain a reference to Demetrius' conflict with Ptolemy II; see note 2 on 42 and Dorandi in this volume.

9–10 *fort.* ὁ δ' ἐναντ[ί]λος] τῷ παροφθέντ[ι] Meillier, *vel* ἐναντ[ί]ως]

Killed by an Asp

- 42** Cicero, *In Defence of Rabirius Postumus* 9.23 (BT 25.60.16–61.1 Olechowska)

We hear¹ that the man, who was easily the most learned man by far of the whole of Greece, Plato, was subjected to the greatest dangers and treacherous attacks through the iniquity of Dionysius, tyrant of Sicily, to whom he had entrusted himself; that Callisthenes, a learned man, companion of Alexander the Great, was murdered by Alexander; that Demetrius, called the Phalerean, a man renowned and famous both because of his excellent government of the Athenian state and because of his learning, was deprived of his life in that same kingdom of Egypt by an asp being applied to his body.²

¹ Cicero is making the point (22) that Postumus, a man not particularly learned, can hardly be blamed for making the same mistake extremely learned men like Plato, Callisthenes and Demetrius had made before him, i.e. that of entering royal service of their own accord.

² Under Ptolemy II Philadelphus, whose reign started in 283/2, Demetrius fell into disfavor; cp. Hermippus in D.L. 5.78 (= 1.40–3; 51–3).

Luxuria

43A Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 12.60 542B–543A (BT 3.195.18–197.10 Kaibel)

34 W

C Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Φαληρεὺς, ὥς φησι Δοῦρις ἐν τῇ
ἐκκαιδεκάτῃ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν, χιλίων καὶ διακοσίων
ταλάντων κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν κύριος γενόμενος καὶ ἀπὸ
τούτων βραχέα δαπανῶν εἰς τοὺς στρατιώτας καὶ τὴν
τῆς πόλεως διοίκησιν τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα διὰ τὴν ἔμφυτον 5
ἀκρασίαν ἠφάνιζεν, θοίνας καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν
λαμπρὰς ἐπιτελῶν καὶ πληθὸς τι συνδείπνων ἔχων. καὶ
ταῖς μὲν δαπάναις ταῖς εἰς τὰ δεῖπνα τοὺς Μακεδόνας
ὑπερέβαλλε, τῇ δὲ καθαριότητι Κυπρίους καὶ Φοίνι-
D κας· ῥάσματά τε μύρων ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἀνθινά τε 10
πολλὰ τῶν ἐδαφῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀνδρῶσιν κατεσκευάζετο
διαπεποικιλμένα ὑπὸ δημιουργῶν.

ἦσαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς γυναῖκας ὁμιλίας σιωπώμεναι καὶ
νεανίσκων ἔρωτες νυκτερινοί, καὶ ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις τιθέ-
μενος θεσμοὺς Δημήτριος καὶ τοὺς βίους τάττων ἀνομο- 15
θέτητον ἑαυτῷ τὸν βίον κατεσκεύαζεν.

ἐπεμελεῖτο δὲ καὶ τῆς ὄψεως, τὴν τε τρίχα τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς
κεφαλῆς ξανθίζόμενος καὶ παιδέρωτι τὸ πρόσωπον
ὑπαλειφόμενος καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀλείμμασιν ἐγχρίων
ἑαυτόν· ἠβούλετο γὰρ τὴν ὄψιν ἰλαρὸς καὶ τοῖς ἀπαν- 20
τῶσιν ἡδὺς φαίνεσθαι.

E ἐν δὲ τῇ πομπῇ τῶν Διονυσίων, ἣν ἔπεμψεν ἄρχων
γενόμενος, ἦδεν ὁ χορὸς εἰς αὐτὸν ποιήματα Σείρωνος
τοῦ Σολέως, ἐν οἷς ἡλιόμορφος προσηγορεύετο·

“ἐξόχως δ' εὐγενέτας ἡλιόμορφος ζαθέοις ἄρχων σε 25
τιμαῖσι γεραίρει.”

9 W

Καρύστιος δὲ ὁ Περγαμηνὸς ἐν τρίτῳ Ὑπομνημάτων
“Δημήτριος,” φησὶν, “ὁ Φαληρεὺς Ἱμεραίου τοῦ
ἀδελφοῦ ἀναιρεθέντος ὑπ' Ἀντιπάτρου αὐτὸς μετὰ
Νικάνορος διέτριβεν, αἰτίαν ἔχων ὥς τὰ ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ 30
ἀδελφοῦ θύων. Κασάνδρῳ δὲ γενόμενος φίλος μέγα
ἴσχυσεν. καὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν ἦν αὐτοῦ τὸ ἄριστον
ὀξύβαφα παντοδαπὰς ἐλάας ἔχοντα καὶ τυρὸν νησιω-
τικόν. ὥς δ' ἐπλούτησε, Μοσχίωνα τὸν ἄριστον τῶν τότε

35 W

F

Profligate Living

- 43A** Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 12.60 542B–543A (BT 3.195.18–197.10 Kaibel)

C According to Duris in the sixteenth book of his *Histories*, Demetrius of Phalerum, when he had gained control over an income of twelve hundred talents a year, spent only a little out of this income on the army and the administration of the city; the remainder he completely squandered through his innate lack of self-control: every day he organized splendid parties with a great number of guests; in the costs of the dinners he surpassed the Macedonians; in their refinement (he surpassed) the Cyprians and Phoenicians. Showers of perfume fell on the ground and many of the floors in the men's quarters were decorated with flowers, arranged in colourful patterns by craftsmen.

D There were also secret meetings with women and nocturnal love-affairs with young men. And thus Demetrius who was laying down laws for other people and regulating their lives, organized his own life with utter freedom from law.

His personal appearance was also a matter of concern to him: he dyed the hair on his head blond, and touched his face with rouge, and rubbed himself with the other anointing-oils. For he wanted to make a cheerful and pleasing impression by his outward appearance on all who met him.

- E During the procession at the Festival of Dionysus, which he organized while being archon,¹ the chorus sang verses of Siron of Soli in his honor; in these he was spoken of as 'shaped like the sun':

"The archon, eminently well-born, shaped like the sun, honors thee with very sacred honours."

- F Carystius of Pergamon in the third book of his *Records* says: "When Himeraeus, the brother of Demetrius of Phalerum, had been killed by Antipater, Demetrius dwelt with Nicanor, being accused of offering sacrifices for his brother's epiphany.² By becoming a friend of Cassander he acquired great power. In the beginning his luncheon consisted of bowls of all kinds of olives and island cheese. But after he had become rich, he bought Moschion, the best of the cooks and caterers at that time. The

μαγείρων καὶ δειπνοποιῶν ἐωνήσατο, καὶ τοσαῦτα ἦν τὰ 35
 παρασκευαζόμενα καθ' ἡμέραν ὥστε χαρισαμένου τῷ
 Μοσχίωνι τὰ λείψανα Μοσχίων ἐν ἔτεσι δύο τρεῖς
 συνοικίας ἐωνήσατο παῖδάς τε ἐλευθέρους ὕβριζεν καὶ
 γυναῖκας τὰς τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων. ἐζηλοτύπουν δὲ 40
 πάντες οἱ παῖδες τὸν ἐρώμενον αὐτοῦ Δίογνιν· καὶ
 τοσοῦτον ἦν τῷ Δημητρίῳ προσελθεῖν ὥστε μετ' ἄριστον
 543A αὐτοῦ περιπατήσαντος παρὰ τοὺς Τρίποδας συνῆλθον
 εἰς τὸν τόπον παῖδες (οἱ) κάλλιστοι ταῖς ἐξῆς ἡμέραις, ἵν'
 ὀφθεῖεν αὐτῷ.”

1–44 *Ath. Epit.* (2.2.92.34–93.12 *Peppink*) [= *EC*], *omissis* 6–7
 θοίνας—ἔχων, 10–12 ἀνθινά—δημιουργῶν, 27–35 Καρύστιος—
 ἐωνήσατο, 38–9 παῖδάς—ἐπιφανεστάτων 1–26 *Duris* 76 *F* 10
FGrH 10 ῥάσματά—γῆν] *Eust. Od.* 20.150 (2.231.43–232.1
Stallbaum) 14–15 ὁ—θεσμούς] *v. ad* 20A.2 23–6 ἦδεν—
 γεραίρει] *Eust. Od.* 6.163 (1.247.8–10 *Stallbaum*) 22 πομπῇ] *cf.*
 89.22–3 24 ἡλιόμορφος] *cf.* 1.17–18; 2.8–9; 5.2–4 25–6
*Castorio(n) Diehl III*³ *p.* 67; *PMG* 845; *SH no.* 312; *sed West GM* 143
sub nomine 'Siron of Soloi' 27–44 *Caryst. F* 10 *FHG IV* 358 27–
 32 228 *T* 2a *FGrH* 28–9 Ἱμεραίου—ἀναιρεθέντος] *cf.* 13A–B
 31–2 Κασάνδρῳ—ἴσχυσεν] *v. ad* 16A.15–17 36–8 χαρισαμένου
 —ἐωνήσατο] *Eust. Od.* 1.140 (1.36.12–13 *Stallbaum*)

9 καθαριότητι *EC*: καθαριότητι *A* 10 ἔπιπτεν *A*: πίπτειν ποιῶν *EC*
 || ἀνθινά *Musurus*: ἀθινά *A* 13 *post* γυναῖκας *add.* αὐτῷ *EC* 20 →

43B

Aelianus, *Varia historia* 9.9 (BT 103.23–104.8 Dilts)

34 W

Δημήτριος ὁ πολιορκητὴς ἦρει τὰς πόλεις καὶ τῇ
 ἑαυτοῦ τρυφῇ καταχρώμενος χίλια μὲν καὶ διακόσια
 τάλαντα πρόσοδον ἑαυτῷ περιποιήσατο καθ' ἕκαστον
 ἔτος καὶ ἐκ τούτων ὀλίγα μὲν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον
 ἐδαπάνη, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ εἰς τὴν ἀκολασίαν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ. 5
 μύροις τε ἐρραίνετο [καὶ] αὐτῷ τὸ δάπεδον καὶ καθ'
 ἑκάστην ἔτους ὥραν τὰ ἐνακμάζοντα τῶν ἀνθῶν [ταῦτα]
 ὑπεσπείρετο αὐτῷ, ἵνα κατ' αὐτῶν βαδίζῃ. ἦν δὲ καὶ
 πρὸς γυναῖκας ἀκόλαστος καὶ νεανικοῖς ἔρωσιν ἐπε-
 χεῖρει. ἔμελε δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ καλῶ εἶναι εὐθετίζοντι τὴν 10
 τρίχα καὶ ξανθίζομένῳ καὶ ὑπαλειφομένῳ τὸ πρόσωπον
 παιδέρῳτι. καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις δὲ ἐχρήτο ἀλείμμασι, προσ-

meals that were prepared each day were so huge that out of the left-overs, which Demetrius gave to him by way of gratuity, Moschion bought three apartment houses within two years, and harassed freeborn boys and the wives of the most distinguished (citizens). All boys were jealous of his (Demetrius') beloved Diognis; and getting to meet Demetrius was so important to them that, when after lunch Demetrius went out for a walk along the
 543A Street of the Tripods, the best-looking boys assembled there day after day in order that they might be noticed by him."

¹ The procession took place on the 9th of the month Elaphebolion, i.e. in March 308.

² See Wehrli on F 9 p. 50; Bayer *DPhA* 8–9.

post γὰρ *add.* καὶ *EC* 23 ὁ χορὸς *EC*: χορὸς *A* || εἰς αὐτὸν *om.* *EC*, 'immo εἰς τὸν θεὸν, εἰς Βάκχον' *Meineke* || Σείρωνος τοῦ Σολέως] Καστορίωνος *Leopardi*: ποῖημα τὸ Καστορίωνος *Page* 24 ἐν οἷς] ἐν ᾧ *Page* 25 ἡλιόμορφος *Kuhn ex 24* (*cf. Eust.*): ἡπιόμοιρος *A*: ἡπιόμορφος *EC* || ζαθέοις' *Diehl* || τιμαῖσι *Meineke*: τιμαῖς *A*: τιμαῖς σε *Page* || ζαθέοις—γεραίρει *om.* *EC* 28 ἱμαιρέου *A*: *corr. man. rec.* 30–1 'τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ *glossema, fort. αὐτοῦ i.e. 'Αντιπάτρου' Kaibel* 40 Θεόγνιν *Musurus* 42 περιπατοῦντος *EC* 43 οἱ *add. Kaibel ex EC*

43B Aelian, *Miscellaneous History* 9.9 (*BT* 103.23–104.8 Dilts)

Demetrius Poliorcetes¹ captured the cities, and indulging his own luxuriousness acquired for himself an income of twelve hundred talents a year. Of this income he spent only a little on the army, the remainder on the satisfaction of his own immoderate desires. His floor was sprinkled with perfumes and in each season of the year the flowers that were in bloom at that time were strewn under his feet for him to walk on. He had an immoderate desire for women and engaged in love-affairs with young men. Being good-looking was important to him: he had his hair coiffured and dyed blond, touched his face with rouge and also used the other

φιλοτιμούμενος τῇ ῥαθυμίᾳ.

1–13 *falso de Demetrio Poliorceta; cf. Ael. VH 3.16; 12.17*

1 πολιορκητῆς Vx: Φαληρεὺς *Dilts ex Ath.* || ἥρει τὰς πόλεις καὶ *seclus. Dilts coll. VH 3.16* 5 ἀκολασίαν x: ἀκρασίαν V *Ath.* 6 καὶ *del. Korais* || αὐτῷ V: αὐτὸ x || καὶ *om. V* 7 ταῦτα *del. Hercher* 12 ἐχρήτο Vx: ἐχρίετο *Korais ex Ath. seq. Dilts*

Demetrius et Menander

44 Phaedrus, *Fabulae Aesopiae* 5.1 (CSLP 79 Guaglianone)

25 W

Demetrius rex et Menander poeta.

Demetrius qui dictus est Phalereus,
Athenas occupavit imperio improbo.
ut mos est vulgi, passim et certatim ruit:

“feliciter!” succlamant. ipsi principes
illam osculantur, qua sunt oppressi, manum,
tacite gementes tristem fortunae vicem.

quin etiam resides et sequentes otium,
ni defuisse noceat, repunt ultimi;

in quis Menander, nobilis comoediis
quas, ipsum ignorans, legerat Demetrius
et admiratus fuerat ingenium viri,
unguento delibutus, vestitu fluens,
veniebat gressu delicato et languido.

hunc ubi tyrannus vidit extremo agmine:

“quisnam cinaedus ille in conspectum meum
audet venire?” responderunt proximi:

“hic est Menander scriptor.” mutatus statim:

“homo” inquit “fieri non potest formosior.”

2–19 *Men. T9 Koerte; cf. 1.53–7* 2–3 228 *T 3f FGrH; v. ad 16A.15–17* 15 tyrannus] *cf. 17.7*

2 Demetrius rex *GuVi* 5 principes *P²NV*: principis *PGu Vi* 9 repunt *NV*: repetunt *PRo* 12 admiratus *P²NV*: miratus *P* 16 conspectum meum *NV*: conspectu meo *PRo* 18 mutato statu *V* 19 homo—formosior *V: om. PVi*

anointing-oils, devoting himself to his leisure pursuits.²

¹ Apparently Aelian confused the two Demetrii. The opening “Demetrius Poliorcetes captured the cities” clearly refers to Demetrius Poliorcetes (cp. *VH* 3.16), but the remainder is so similar to the passage by Duris cited in Athenaeus (43A.1–21) that it must refer to Demetrius of Phalerum. In *VH* 12.17 Aelian mentions the relationship between what appears to be Demetrius Poliorcetes and the courtesan Lamia (cp. 1.15 and 6). See Jacoby *FGrH* II C 119 on Duris 76 F 10.

² The entry on Demetrius is preceded by one on Dionysius and followed by one on Plato.

Demetrius and Menander

44 Phaedrus, *Aesopic Fables* 5.1 (*CSLP* 79 Guaglianone)

King Demetrius and the Poet Menander.

Demetrius who is called ‘the Phalerean’ holds Athens in the grip of a bad reign. As is the way of the mob, in every direction it rushes eagerly: “What good luck!” they shout. The very leaders kiss the hand that holds them oppressed, while secretly bemoaning the sad turn of fortune. And what’s more, inert and pursuing their own leisure, they are the last to crawl forth to avoid the danger of being absent. In their midst was Menander, noted for his comedies. Demetrius, not personally acquainted with him,¹ had read these (comedies) and was full of admiration for the genius of the man. There came (Menander), besmeared with perfume, his robes flowing, with delicate and languid tread. As soon as the dictator saw him at the end of the train, “Who is that lewd person who dares to come into my presence?” Those standing closest to him answered: “It is Menander, the writer.” Demetrius is transformed on the spot: “Handsomer man,” he says, “there cannot be.”

¹ Menander was a pupil of Theophrastus too (D.L. 5.36 = *Thphr.* no. 18.12 *FHS&G*).

Testimonia incerti temporis

- 45** Polyaeus, *Strategemata* 3.15 (BT 155.23–156.2 Woelfflin & Melber)

^{8 w} Δημήτριος Φαληρεὺς συλλαμβάνεσθαι μέλλων ὑπὸ τοῦ Θρακῶν βασιλέως κατακρύψας αὐτὸν ἐς ἅμαξαν χορτοφόρον ἐς τὴν ὁμορον χώραν διεσώθη.

1–3 *Exc. Polyaeus*. 52.4 (BT 491.21–2 Woelfflin & Melber); *FGrH II b* 643 ad 228 T 1

1 Δ. Φ.] Δ., Φαληρεὺς *omisso*, *F* (*archetypus*) *Exc.*: Δ. ὁ. Φ. *vulg.* 3 ὁμορον] ἰδίαν *Exc.*

- *46** *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 30.325, no. 2

1 Πλείσταρχον
2 Εὐπόλεμον
3 Κάσσα[ν]δρον
4 Δημήτ[ριον]
5 Φ[αλ]η[ρέα]

inversum: ΠΛΕΙ[Σ]ΤΕΑ...

6 [.1-2.]ΚΝΗ . [.1-3. .] Πειρ(α)ιέα

1–6 'ATHENS. DEFIXIONES. ... two lead tablets found in a well in the Kerameikos which also contained many tablets of the Athenian cavalry'; *ed. pr.* K. Braun, *AM* 85 (1970) 197–8 (*phot. tab.* 93,1); *iterum ed.* D.R. Jordan, *MDAI(A)* 95 (1980) 229–36; *cf.* D.R. Jordan, *GRBS* 26 (1985) no. 14 p. 157; John G. Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, 1992, no. 57 p. 145–6

1–6 *Jordan* 4 Δ ΜΗΤ *ed. pr.* 5 Φ Η *ed. pr.*: an Φαλη(ρέα) →

- 47** *Suda*, s.v. Λύκος (no. 814, LG 1.3.295.28–31 Adler)

Λύκος, ὁ καὶ Βουθήρας, Ῥηγῖνος, ἱστορικός, πατὴρ Λυκόφρονος τοῦ τραγικοῦ, ἐπὶ τῶν διαδόχων γεγονῶς καὶ ἐπιβουλευθεὶς ὑπὸ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως. οὗτος ἔγραψεν ἱστορίαν Λιβύης, καὶ περὶ Σικελίας.

1–4 *Lycus Rheginus* 570 T 1 *FGrH* 1–2 *Lycophron* T 4 *TrGF* I 274
3 ἐπιβουλευθεὶς] *cf.* 1.24

→

Of Uncertain Date

- 45 Polyaeus, *Military Stratagems* 3.15 (BT 155.23–156.2 Woelfflin & Melber)

Demetrius of Phalerum, on the point of being arrested by the king of the Thracians, hid himself in a wagon carrying fodder and escaped safely into the neighbouring country.¹

¹ In book 3, Polyaeus mentions Demetrius of Phalerum among a number of Greek *strategoi*; he cites one stratagem of Demetrius. In the excerpt it is listed under the heading “Escape of one man or woman.” Wehrli p. 50 ad F 8 tentatively puts this episode at the end of the Lamian War; Martini, *RE* 4 (1901) 2821 after Cassander’s death in 297.

- *46 *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 30.325, no. 2

Plistarchus,¹ Eupolemus,² Cassander, Demetrius of Phalerum, ... of Piraeus.³

¹ Plistarchus was a brother of Cassander (Plu. *Demetr.* 31.4).

² Eupolemus was one of Cassander’s generals, who was appointed *strategos* for Greece in 312 (D.S. 19.77.6; cf. 20.112; Paus. 1.15.1); Plistarchus at that time was appointed commander of the Macedonian garrison in Chalcis (D.S. 19.77.6).

³ In l. 6 only the demotic appears to be preserved of a fifth intended victim of the curse. On the date of the tablet, see Braun 197–8 (313); Jordan 235–6 (between 313 and 307); and Chr. Habicht, *Pausanias’ Guide to Ancient Greece*, 1985, 77–82 (304; cp. Tracy ADT 43⁴⁰).

legendum; cf. IG II² 1883 inversum Π.Ε..ΤΡΑ ed. pr. 61(NH) ΓΕΜΕΑ ed. pr.

- 47 *Suda*, under *Lycus* (no.814, LG 1.3.295.28–31 Adler)

Lycus, also (called) Boutheras, of Rhegium, a historian, father of Lycophron the tragedian. He lived in the time of the Successors and was plotted against by Demetrius of Phalerum.¹ He wrote a history of Libya, and also on Sicily.

¹ Perhaps this episode is to be put in the time of 35.6–9 (Jacoby *FGrH* II b 645 on T 6a).

- 48 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 2.101 (OCT 1.99.13–20 Long)

43 W ὁ δ' οὖν Θεόδωρος προσκαθίσας ποτὲ Εὐρυκλείδῃ τῷ
 ἱεροφάντῃ, “λέγε μοι,” ἔφη, “Εὐρυκλείδῃ, τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ
 ἀσεβοῦντες περὶ τὰ μυστήρια;” εἰπόντος δ' ἐκείνου, “οἱ
 τοῖς ἀμυήτοις αὐτὰ ἐκφέροντες,” “ἀσεβεῖς ἄρα,” ἔφη,
 “καὶ σύ, τοῖς ἀμυήτοις διηγούμενος.” καὶ μέντοι παρ' 5
 ὀλίγον ἐκινδύνευσεν εἰς Ἄρειον ἀχθῆναι πάγον, εἰ μὴ
 Δημήτριος αὐτὸν ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐρρύσατο. Ἀμφικράτης δ'
 ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν φησι κώνειον πιεῖν αὐτὸν
 καταδικασθέντα.

1–9 *Theod. IV H 13 SSR II 125 Giannantoni* 1–7 *Ars. 297.17–23*
Walz 1–5 *Aristipp. F 263 Mannebach; Clinton, SOEM no. 8 p. 21–*
2 5–9 *Ps.-Hsch. Mil. 35 (BT 29.7–10 Flach) = Theod. T 3B*
Winiarczyk; Aristipp. F 265 Mannebach; Theod. T 3A Winiarczyk 7–
 9 *Amphicr. F 2 FHG IV 300*

6 ἀχθῆναι *BPF*: ἀναχθῆναι *DGTW*

- 49 Myronianus ap. Diogenem Laertium, *Vitae philosophorum* 4.14 (OCT 1.172.6–10 Long)

44 W Ἀθηναῖοι δ' ὅμως αὐτὸν ὄντα τοιοῦτον ἐπίπρασκόν
 ποτε, τὸ μετοίκιον ἀτονοῦντα θεῖναι. καὶ αὐτὸν ὠνεῖται
 Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς καὶ ἐκάτερον ἀποκατέστησε·
 Ξενοκράτει μὲν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, Ἀθηναίοις δὲ τὸ
 μετοίκιον. τοῦτό φησι Μυρωνιανὸς ὁ Ἀμαστριανὸς ἐν 5
 τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἱστορικῶν ὁμοίων κεφαλαίων.

1–6 *Xenocrates F 2 Isnardi p. 57–8* 1–5 *Ps.-Hsch. Mil. 50 (BT 40.12–*
16 Flach) 4 Ξενοκράτει] *cf. 131A–C* 5–6 *Myronianus*
Amastrianus F 4 FHG IV 455

6 Ἱστορικῶν *FP*: ἱστοριῶν *B*

Demetrius Legislator

cf. **16B.12**; **20A–B**; **40.4**; **43A.14–15**; **58A.3**; **104.18**
 de gynaeconomis vide **153**
 de eisangelia vide **96A–B**

- 48** Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 2.101 (OCT 1.99.13–20 Long)

However that may be, Theodorus once sat down beside Euryclides the hierophant¹ and said, “Tell me, Euryclides, who are the ones who commit sacrilege with respect to the Mysteries?” He answered, “Those who divulge them to the uninitiated.” “Then you too,” Theodorus said, “commit sacrilege by recounting them to the uninitiated.” And, as a matter of fact, he was almost brought before the Areopagus,² if Demetrius of Phalerum had not rescued him. But according to Amphicrates in his *On Famous Men* he was convicted and drank hemlock.

¹ The hierophant was the High Priest of the cult of Demeter at Eleusis.

² Presumably on a charge of impiety; according to D.L. 2.102 Theodorus (called “the Godless”) left Athens too and stayed with Ptolemy I.

- 49** Myronianus in Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 4.14 (OCT 1.172.6–10 Long)

Still, once when he (Xenocrates) was unable to pay the tax imposed on resident aliens, the Athenians put him, though he was the man he was,¹ up for sale. Demetrius of Phalerum both bought him and made restitution on both sides: to Xenocrates (he restored) his freedom and to the Athenians their tax.² This is said by Myronianus of Amastris in the first book of his *Chapters of Historical Parallels*.

¹ This statement is preceded by a survey of Xenocrates’ writings.

² Apparently metics—Xenocrates was from Calchedon (D.L. 4.6)—who did not pay their tax, were liable to a charge of ‘not having a patron’. In case of conviction, their property could be confiscated and they themselves could be sold as slaves. According to Myronianus, Demetrius ‘bought him’ out by paying the tax. See D. Whitehead, *RhM* 124 (1981) 235–8 and Dorandi, *Festschrift W. Kullmann*, 1997, 277–8, and in this volume.

Demetrius Legislator

cp. **16B.12; 20A–B; 40.4; 43A.14–15; 58A. 3; 104.18**

on the ‘inspectors of women’ see **153**

on impeachment see **96A–B**

Feriae Publicae

- 50 Plutarchus, *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* 24 818C–D (BT 5.1.108.8–11; 14–21 Hubert)

30 W δῆμῳ δ' ὕβριν μὲν οὐδεμίαν εἰς πολίτας οὐδὲ
 δήμευσιν ἀλλοτρίων οὐδὲ κοινῶν διανέμῃσιν ὁ
 πολιτικὸς ἐφήσει κατὰ δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ πείθων καὶ
 διδάσκων καὶ δεδιττόμενος διαμαχεῖται ταῖς τοιαύταις
 ἐπιθυμίαις, ... ἐὰν δ' ἐορτὴν πάτριον οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ θεοῦ 5
 D τιμὴν πρόφασιν λαβόντες ὁρμήσωσι πρὸς τινα θεάν ἢ
 νέμῃσιν ἐλαφρὰν ἢ χάριν τινὰ φιλάνθρωπον ἢ φιλο-
 τιμίαν, ἔστω πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἅμα καὶ
 τῆς εὐπορίας ἀπόλαυσις αὐτοῖς. καὶ γὰρ τοῖς Περι-
 κλέους πολιτεύμασι καὶ τοῖς Δημητρίου πολλὰ τοιαῦτ' 10
 ἔνεστι, καὶ Κίμων ἐκόσμησε τὴν ἀγορὰν πλατάνων
 φυτεῖαις καὶ περιπάτοις.

9–10 Περικλέους] *Plu. Per.* 12 10 τοῖς Δημητρίου] cf. 43A.22–6;
 54; 55A–B; 89.22–4 11 Κίμων] *Plu. Cim.* 13.5–7; *Agora III* no. 718
 p. 219

Census Atheniensium

- 51 Ctesicles ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae* 6.103 272C (BT 2.104.18–24 Kaibel)

31 W Κτησικλῆς δ' ἐν τρίτῃ Χρονικῶν †καὶ δεκάτῃ † πρὸς
 ταῖς ἑκατόν φησιν Ὀλυμπιάδα Ἀθήνησιν ἐξετασμὸν
 γενέσθαι ὑπὸ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως τῶν κατοι-
 κούντων τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ εὐρεθῆναι Ἀθηναίους μὲν
 δισμυρίους πρὸς τοῖς χιλίοις, μετοίκους δὲ μυρίους, 5

Public Festivals

- 50 Plutarch, *Political Precepts* 24 818 C–D (BT 5.1.108.8–11; 14–21 Hubert)

As far as lies in his power, a statesman will not allow the people any act of violence against fellow-citizens, no confiscation of other people's property nor yet distribution of public funds; on the contrary, he will combat such desires by persuasion and instruction and admonition, ... If, on the other hand, the masses find a pretext in a traditional festival in honour of a god and are bent on some spectacle or a small distribution or a boon for the welfare of the public or an act of private munificence, they should be allowed to enjoy the liberty and (to have) the means to do so. After all, there are many things of that sort among the public acts of Pericles and also of Demetrius, and Cimon too adorned the Agora having plane-trees planted and promenades laid out.¹

¹ Plutarch goes on to cite the instance of Cato who during the Catilinarian disturbances persuaded the Senate to distribute food among the poor.

Census of the Athenians

- 51 Ctesicles in Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 6.103 272C (BT 2.104.18–24 Kaibel)

According to Ctesicles in the third book of his *Chronicles*, a census of the inhabitants of Attica was held in Athens by Demetrius of Phalerum in the 11...th Olympiad;¹ the number of Athenian citizens was found to be 21,000, of resident aliens

οἰκετῶν δὲ μυριάδας μ'.

1–5 *Stesiclides (Ctesicles)* 245 F 1 FGrH; *Ath. Epit.* (2.1.115.1–4 Peppink) [= EC] 2 ἐξετασμὸν] cf. 16A.15; *de priore censu* a. 322/1 cf. *D.S.* 18.18.5 et *Plu. Phoc.* 28.7

1 Στησικλῆς *dubitanter Jacoby* 1–2 ἐν τρίτῃ—ὀλυμπιάδα] ἐν τρίτῃ καὶ δεκάτῃ πρὸς ταῖς ρ' ὀλυμπιάδι EC, i.e. a. 328/7–325/4 || †καὶ δεκάτῃ† ... ὀλυμπιάδα] καὶ δεκάτῃ ... ὀλυμπιάδα A: (τῇ ἐκ)καιδεκάτῃ ... ὀλυμπιάδι *Casaubonus*, i.e. a. 316/5–313/2: (κατὰ τὴν ἑπτα)καιδεκάτην ... ὀλυμπιάδα *Dindorf seq. Kaibel*, i.e. a. 312/1–309/8: (κατὰ τὴν πεντε)καιδεκάτην ... ὀλυμπιάδα *Jacoby*, i.e. a. 320/19–317/6 6 μυριάδας μ'] τετρακισμύριοι *Hume* 1752: μυριάδας ι' *S. Lauffer, Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*, 1979, 151: μυριάδας μ' ex MM = δισμύριοι *explic. A. Dreizehnter, Klio* 54 (1972) 148–9

Nomophylakes

52

Pollux, *Onomasticon* 8.102 (LG 9.2.133.1–7 Bethe)

32 W

142 W

οἱ ἑνδεκα εἰς ἅφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἐγίνετο, καὶ γραμματεὺς αὐτοῖς συνηριθμεῖτο. νομοφύλακες δὲ κατὰ τὸν Φαληρέα μετωνομάσθησαν. ἐπεμελοῦντο δὲ τῶν ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ, καὶ ἀπῆγον κλέπτας ἀνδραποδιστὰς λωποδύτας, εἰ μὲν ὁμολογοῖεν, θανατώσοντες, εἰ δὲ μή, 5 εἰσάξοντες εἰς τὰ δικαστήρια, κἂν ἀλῶσιν, ἀποκτενοῦντες. τοῦ δὲ νομοφυλακίου θύρα μία χαρώνειον ἐκαλεῖτο, δι' ἧς τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ἀπῆγοντο.

1–8 *schol. Arethae in Pl. Phd.* 59E (424.15–21 *Greene*) 1–7 οἱ ἑνδεκα] cf. *Schol. Ar. V.* 1108; *Phot.* 1.43–4 *Porson*; *AB* 1.250.4–9; *Lex. Vind. no.* 257 = *Lex. Sabb.* 58.22–7 = *EM* 338.31–8 1–3 228 F 26 FGrH 2 νομοφύλακες] cf. *Anon. Argent.* 24 (= 329 F 6 FGrH); *Harp. v* 19 (= *Philoch.* 328 F 64a FGrH); *schol. in Aeschin.* 3.13; *schol. in Thuc.* 5.47.9; *Hsch.* θ 78 *Latte*; *Suda* θ 266; ν 487; οἱ 124 = *Phot.* 1.276 *Porson* (= 328 F 64bβ FGrH); *Lex. Rhet. Cant.* 22.1–10 *Houtsma* (= 328 F 64bα FGrH); *AB* 1.191.21–2 7 νομοφυλακίου] cf. *Hsch.* χ 217 *Schmidt*; *Suda* μ 1003; ν 488; χ 140; *Zen.* 6.41 (CPG 1.173.8–9)

1 φυλῆς] βουλῆς *ABL* 3 Φαληρέα] Φ. Δημήτριον *schol. Pl.* || ἐπιμελοῦνται *FS* 6 εἰσάξοντες] ἐτάζοντες *schol. Pl.*

10,000, and of slaves 400,000.²

¹ The text is corrupt. The emendations reflect the assumed purpose of the census: a property census (cp. **16A.15**) in 317 or 316 (Jacoby); a census for military purposes either in 313 (Casaubon) or in 309/8 (Ste Croix); see M.H. Hansen, *Demography* 28–36.

² The number of slaves has been changed into 40,000 (Hume), 100,000 (Lauffer) or 20,000 (Dreizehnter). In this section (272B), however, the statement of Timaeus of Tauromenium (566 F 11b *FGrH*) that the Greeks were not in the habit of acquiring slaves, is refuted by Masurius who quotes a number of sources giving very large numbers of slaves, e.g. 460,000 for Corinth.

Guardians of the Law

52 Pollux, *Nomenclature* 8.102 (*LG* 9.2.133.1–7 Bethe)

The (board of) Eleven was composed of one man from each tribe, a secretary being included in this number. In the time of the Phalerean their name was changed to ‘Guardians of the Law’. They took care of those in prison, and arrested thieves, slave-dealers and robbers, to put them to death if they admitted (their crime), and if (they did) not, to bring them before the courts of justice, and if they were convicted, to execute them. One door of the office of the Guardians of the Law was called the door of Charon, through which (those convicted) were taken away on their way to death.¹

¹ On the ‘door of Charon’ see *Agora* III 149.

De Sepulcris

- 53 Cicero, *De Legibus* 2.25.62–27.67 (HT 20.83.25–85.23 Ziegler-Görler)

MARCUS. recte requiris. quos enim ad sumptus progressa iam ista res sit, in C. Figuli sepulcro uidisse <te> credo. minimam olim istius rei fuisse cupiditatem multa extant exempla maiorum. nostrae quidem legis interpretes, quo capite iubentur sumptum et luctum remouere a deorum Manium iure, hoc intellegant in primis, sepulcrorum magnificentiam esse minuendam. 5

- 135 W 63 nec haec a sapientissimis legum scriptoribus neglecta sunt. nam et †Athenis iam illo mores† a Cecrope ut aiunt permansit hoc ius terra humandi, quod quom proxumi fecerant obductaque terra erat, frugibus obserebatur, ut sinus et gremium quasi matris mortuo tribueretur, solum autem frugibus expiatum ut uiuis redderetur. sequebantur epulae quas inibant propinqui coronati, apud quos de mortui laude quom siquid ueri erat praedicatum—nam mentiri 15 nefas habebatur—iusta confecta erant.

- 64 postea quom, ut scribit Phalereus, sumptuosa fieri funera et lamentabilia coepissent, Solonis lege sublata sunt, quam legem eisdem prope uerbis nostri Xuiri in decimam tabulam coniecerunt. nam de tribus reciniis et pleraque illa Solonis sunt. de lamentis uero expressa uerbis sunt: “mulieres genas ne radunto neue lessum funeris ergo habento.” 20

- 26 de sepulcris autem nihil est apud Solonem amplius quam “ne quis ea deleat neue alienum inferat,” poenaeque est, “si quis bustum—nam id puto appellari τύμβον—aut monumentum” inquit “aut columnam uiolarit deiecerit fregerit.” 25 sed post aliquanto propter has amplitudines sepulcrorum,

On Burials

- 53 Cicero, *On Laws* 2.25.62–27.67 (HT 20.83.25–85.23 Ziegler-Görler)

MARCUS: You are right to ask for that.¹ For you have seen, I believe, in the case of the tomb of C. Figulus² to what exorbitant outlay this business has already come. There exist many examples of our forefathers (which show) that of old there was very little inclination for that sort of thing. Indeed, the interpreters of our law need only to look at the clause in which they are ordered to remove outlay and mourning from the right of the Gods of the Nether World; then they will understand this above all, that the magnificence of tombs is to be diminished.

- 63 Nor have these things been neglected by the wisest legislators, for †in Athens too already customs†,³ it is said, this right of burying in earth has remained from Cecrops onwards. When the next of kin had performed this and the earth had been laid over (the body), the place was sown with grain, in order that the bosom and womb as it were of his mother be assigned to the deceased, but the soil, cleansed by grain, restored to the living. There followed a festive meal that the relations attended wearing garlands. In this company, when the deceased had received a speech of praise, if anything true could be said (in his praise)—for it was considered impermissible to utter a falsehood—the burial rites were performed.

- 64 Later, after funerals had begun to grow more sumptuous and full of laments, as the Phalerean writes, they were abolished by Solon's legal decree. Our own decemvirs⁴ have recorded this law in almost the same words in the tenth Table. For what it says about the three veils and most of the things written there are from Solon, but with reference to laments he has been followed to the letter: "Women shall not tear their cheeks, nor engage in wailing on account of a funeral."

- 26 On graves, however, there is nothing more in Solon than "that no one shall destroy them or place the body of another in them," and there is a penalty "in case any one violates," he says, "overturns or breaks a burial mound—which is what I take *tumbos* to refer to—or memorial or column." But a little later, on account of

quas in Ceramico uidemus, lege sanctum est, “ne quis
 sepulcrum faceret operosius quam quod decem homines
 65 effecerint triduo,” neque id opere tectorio exornari nec 30
 hermas hos quos uocant licebat inponi, nec de mortui laude
 nisi in publicis sepulturis, nec ab alio nisi qui publice ad eam
 rem constitutus esset dici licebat. sublata etiam erat cele-
 britas uirorum ac mulierum, quo lamentatio minueretur;
 66 auget enim luctum concursus hominum. quocirca Pittacus 35
 omnino accedere quemquam uetat in funus aliorum.

sed ait rursus idem Demetrius increbuisse eam funerum
 sepulcrorumque magnificentiam quae nunc fere Romae est.
 quam consuetudinem lege minuit ipse. fuit enim hic uir ut
 scitis non solum eruditissimus, sed etiam ciuis e re publica 40
 maxime tuendaeque ciuitatis paratissimus. is igitur sump-
 tum minuit non solum poena sed etiam tempore: ante lucem
 enim iussit efferri. sepulcris autem nouis finiuit modum;
 nam super terrae tumulum noluit quid<quam> statui, nisi
 columellam tribus cubitis ne altiore aut mensam aut label- 45
 lum, et huic procurationi certum magistratum praefecerat.
 27 67 haec igitur Athenienses tui.

8–47 228 F 9 FGrH; Solon F 72a Ruschenbusch = T 469 Martina 18
 Solonis lege] cf. Cic. Leg. 2.23.59 (Solon F 72b Ruschenbusch = T 468
 Martina); legem ap. Dem. 43.62 (Solon T 466 Martina); Plu. Sol. 21.5–
 7 (Solon F 72c Ruschenbusch = T 470 Martina) 19 in decimam
 tabulam] no. 40 RS II 704–11 20 de tribus reciniis] no. 40 X,3 RS II
 705–6; cf. Cic. Leg. 2.23.59 et Plu. Sol. 21.6 21–2 mulieres—
 habento] no. 40 X,4 RS II 706–7; cf. Cic. Leg. 2.23.59 et Plu. Sol. 21.6
 25 bustum] no. 40 X,9–10 RS II 711 28–30 ne quis—triduo] cf. Pl.
 Lg. 12 958E6–7 39–41 v. sub ‘Iudicia’ 41–2 is igitur sumptum
 minuit] cf. 1.11–12; 89.17–21; 115.9–13 44–5 nisi—labellum] cf.
 Pl. Lg. 12 958E8–959A1 46 magistratum] cf. Plu. Sol. 21.7

2 processa iam esta (ista H²)V: corr. edd. ll te add. Madvig 4 extant
 exempla Madvig: extarent ampla V 9 Athenis iam illo mores A¹B¹H
 (mos ille H mg.): ille mos A²B²: Atheniensium in more Ziegler: Athenis,
 <nostis> iam illos mores Vahlen: Athenis illorum more Büchner 10
 hoc ius] corpus Stephanus: hucusque Ziegler ll quod Turnebus: quam
 V 14 inibant Camerarius: inirant B¹H: inirent B²A ll quos Madvig:
 quas AB: quaque H 15 siquid Turnebus: niquid AB: uiquid H 16
 iusta confecta Manutius: adiusta coniecta A¹H: adiuxta coniecta
 A²B 17 quom Manutius: quam V ll post Phalereus add. Demetrius
 Ziegler 19 Xviri Stephanus: suiri V 25 τὸ μῆλον aut] tum bona ut V →

the huge dimensions of the tombs which we see in the Ceramicus, it was decreed by law that “no one shall build a more elaborate
 65 tomb than can be completed by ten men within three days” and that this tomb shall not be covered with decorations and there shall not be set up what are called Hermes pillars. Also speaking in praise of the deceased was not allowed except in public funerals nor by anyone except the person officially appointed to this function. Large gatherings of men and women were abolished in order to restrict lamentation, since mourning is increased by a
 66 gathering of people. This is the ground for Pittacus’ prohibition against funerals being attended by any non-relatives.⁵

But again the same Demetrius says that the magnificence of funerals and graves increased to roughly what it is now in Rome, a custom on which he himself placed legal restrictions, for as you know he was not only a very learned person but also to the highest degree a citizen of his community, and most apt at governing the city. He restricted expenses not just by imposing a penalty but also by setting a time: he ordered that burials were to take place before the light of day. Moreover, he limited the size of new tombs: he did not wish to have anything erected above the mound of earth except a small column, not more than three cubits high, or a table or basin, and he appointed a magistrate specifically to look after this.

27 67 That’s what your⁶ Athenians have done in this matter.

¹ In sections 59–62, Cicero has discussed the sumptuary regulations in the Twelve Tables regarding burials and Atticus has responded by saying that he would like to have regulations regarding tombs as well.

² Probably C. Marcius Figulus, consul in 64 B.C.; about his tomb nothing is known.

³ The text is corrupt, but the meaning clearly is that this “right of burying” has already existed in Athens from times immemorial.

⁴ I.e., the ‘Ten-men’.

⁵ Pittacus of Mytilene (c. 650–570 B.C.).

⁶ See note 1.

26 *deiecerit dett.*: iacerit *AH*: acerit *B* 31 hermas hos *Stephanus*: hermasos *A*:
 ermasos *B*: ernam hos *H* 35 auget *Ursinus*: huc *A¹H*: hunc *A²*: huic *B* 36
 alienorum *Bake*: alienum *Ziegler* 40–1 e r. p. maxime *V*: in r. p. -us *Zumpt*
Ziegler 41 paratissimus *V*: perit. *Stephanus Ziegler* || is *Madvig*: isti *A¹BH*:
 iste *A²* 42 poena: pecunia *Plinval* 43 nouis *edd.*: nobis *V* 44 noluit *edd.*:
 uoluit *V* || quidquam *Lambinus*: quod *V*

Architectura

- 54** Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 7, praef.16–17 (CB 9.3–10 Liou-Zuinghedau)

29 W
17 Eleusine Cereris et Proserpinae cellam inmani magnitudine Ictinos dorico more sine exterioribus columnis ad laxamentum usus sacrificiorum pertexit. eam autem postea, cum Demetrius Phalereus Athenis rerum potiretur, Philo ante templum in fronte columnis constitutis prostylon fecit. 5

4 Demetrius—potiretur] v. ad **16A.15–17** || Philo] cf. **132**

3 eam editio princeps: ea GHW: ei VS

Homeristae

- 55A** Aristocles ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae* 14.12 620B (BT 3.367.15–18 Kaibel)

33 W ὅτι δ' ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ ῥαψωδοὶ καὶ Ὀμηρισταὶ Ἀριστοκλῆς εἶρηκεν ἐν τῷ Περὶ χορῶν. τοὺς δὲ νῦν Ὀμηριστὰς ὀνομαζομένους πρῶτος εἰς τὰ θέατρα παρήγαγε Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς.

1-2 Aristocl. Hist. F 10 FHG IV 331 1-4 Ath. Epit. (2.2.127.32-4 Peppink)

- 55B** Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* 24.482 (4.937.18–24 van der Valk)

33 W εἰκότως οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς ἐφιλεῖτο τοῖς γε τὸ καλὸν εἰδόσιν. ἱστοροῦνται γοῦν φιλόμηροι μάλιστα μὲν ὁ μέγας Ἀλέξανδρος, ἥδη δὲ καὶ Κάσανδρος, ὁ καὶ αὐτὸς Μακεδόνων βασιλεύς, οὕτω φιλῶν Ὅμηρον ὥς διὰ στόματος, φασίν, ἔχειν τῶν ἐπῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ πολλά. ἦν δὲ 5 τοιοῦτος καὶ ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος, ὃς πρῶτος εἰς θέατρον παρήγαγε, φασί, ῥαψωδοὺς τοὺς καὶ Ὀμη-

Architecture

- 54** Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 7, pref. 16–17 (CB 9.3–10 Liou-Zuinghedau)

In Eleusis the shrine of Ceres and Proserpine is of an immense size. Ictinus had it covered in Dorian manner without exterior columns, in order to provide ample room for making sacrifices.¹

- 17 Later however, when Demetrius of Phalerum obtained supreme power in Athens, Philo made it into a prostyle building by having columns placed before the temple in front.²

¹ On the Telesterion, as designed by Ictinus, see G.E. Mylonas *Eleusis* 113–17.

² On the construction of the portico, started already in the 350's, see G.E. Mylonas *Eleusis* 130–5; E. Fabricius, *RE* 20,1 (1941) 58–9. It was dodecastyle and measured c. 54.50 m. by 11.35 m.

Homerists

- 55A** Aristocles in Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 14.12 620B (BT 3.367.15–18 Kaibel)

In *On Choruses*, Aristocles said that the rhapsodes were also called 'Homerists'. But those (who are) now named 'Homerists' were first introduced into the theatres by Demetrius of Phalerum.¹

¹ Athenaeus has just quoted Carystius about Cassander, who was so fond of the Homeric poems that he knew most of them by heart.

- 55B** Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer's Iliad* 24.482 (4.937.18–24 van der Valk)

Thus it is understandable that the poet was loved especially by those who knew what is beautiful. Alexander the Great, for instance, is reported to have been a great lover of Homer; to give another example, Cassander, himself also king of the Macedonians, loved Homer so much, they say, as to know most of his verses by heart. Demetrius of Phalerum too shared this love for Homer: he was the first to introduce, they say, the rhapsodes who

ριστὰς καλουμένους, οἱ ἐμελώδουν τὰ τοῦ Ὀμήρου,
καθάπερ ἄλλοι τὰ Ἑσιόδου καὶ Ἀρχιλόχου καὶ
ἐτέρων. ...

3 Ἀλέξανδρος] *Plu. Alex.* 8.2 (= *Onesicr.* 134 F 38 FGrH) et 26.1–3;
De Alex. fort. aut virt. 4 327F; *Str.* 13.1.27; *Plin. H.N.* 7.29(30).107 ||
Κάσανδρος] *Caryst. ap. Ath.* 14.12 620B (= F 8 FHG IV 358)

1–9 *haec verba Eust. ipse in codice L adiecit*

Iudicia

cf. Democharem ap. Polybium, *Historiae* 12.13.9–11 = **89.14–27**

de iudicio Ciceronis cf. **36.12–16**; **42.6–7**; **53.40–1**; **56.7–8**;
57.13–16; et *Epistulas ad Familiares* 16.22.2 (BT 603.13–20
Shackleton Bailey)

56 Cicero, *De Republica* 2.1.2 (CB 2.7.10–8.9 Bréguet)

16W

is dicere solebat ob hanc causam praestare nostrae
ciuitatis statum ceteris ciuitatibus quod in illis singuli
fuissent fere quorum suam quisque rem publicam constit-
uisset legibus atque institutis suis, ut Cretum Minos,
Lacedaemoniorum Lycurgus, Atheniensium, quae persaepe 5
commutata esset, tum Theseus, tum Draco, tum Solo, tum
Clisthenes, tum multi alii, postremo exsanguem iam et
iacentem doctus uir Phalereus sustentasset Demetrius,
nostra autem res publica non unius esset ingenio sed
multorum, nec una hominis uita sed aliquot constituta 10
saeculis et aetatibus.

5–8 228 T 3e FGrH 7–8 v. ad **16A.15–17** 8 doctus vir] v. ad **17.8**
|| sustentasset] v. ad **19.10–11**

2 singulis *P sed s exp.* 3 quorum *Pc*: qui *P* || suam *Pc*: sua *P* 4 atque
institutis] atque instituisset legibus atque institutis *P sed tria prima verba*
exp. 10 uita *Pc*: ulla *P*

57 Cicero, *De Legibus* 3.6.14 (HT 20.95.4–25 Ziegler-Görler)

ATTICUS. ain tandem? etiam a Stoicis ista tractata sunt?

are also called ‘Homerists’ into the theatre. These men chanted the (verses) of Homer, as others those of Hesiod, Archilochus and others.

Judgments

cp. Demochares in Polybius, *Histories* 12.13.9–11 = **89.14–27** on Cicero’s judgment cp. **36.12–16**; **42.6–7**; **53.40–1**; **56.7–8**; **57.13–16**; and *To Friends* 16.22.2 (*BT* 603.13–20 Shackleton Bailey)

56 Cicero, *On the State* 2.1.2 (*CB* 2.7.10–8.9 Bréguet)

He (Cato¹) used to say that the constitution of our state surpassed (that of) other states for the following reason: In those (other states) it was generally individual persons who devised their own constitution, through their laws and institutions, as Minos (created the constitution) of the Cretans (and) Lycurgus (that) of the Spartans. (The constitution) of the Athenians, which has been changed very often, (was founded by) Theseus, then Draco, then Solon, then Cleisthenes, then many others. Finally, when it was already bloodless and prostrate,² it was revived by the learned man from Phalerum, Demetrius. Our constitution, on the other hand, was not established by the genius of one person, but of many, nor in the lifetime of one man, but during a number of centuries and generations.

¹ Scipio is speaking.

² This refers to the situation after the battle of Chaeronea in 338, the period of Macedonian domination.

57 Cicero, *On Laws* 3.6.14 (*HT* 20.95.4–25 Ziegler-Görler)

ATTICUS: Do you really mean it? Has this subject of yours been treated by the Stoics also?¹

postea a magno homine et in primis erudito, Panaetio. nam
 ueteres uerbo tenus acute illi quidem, sed non ad hunc usum
 popularem atque ciuilem, de re publica disserebant. ab hac 5
 familia magis ista manarunt Platone principe. post
 Aristoteles inlustrauit omnem hunc ciuilem in disputando
 locum, Heraclidesque Ponticus profectus ab eodem Platone.
 Theophrastus uero institutus ab Aristotele habitauit ut scitis
 in eo genere rerum, ab eodemque Aristotele doctus 10
 Dicaearchus huic rationi studioque non defuit. post a
 Theophrasto Phalereus ille Demetrius, de quo feci supra
 mentionem, mirabiliter doctrinam ex umbraculis erudit-
 orum otioque non modo in solem atque in puluerem, sed in
 ipsum discrimen aciemque produxit. nam et mediocriter 15
 doctos magnos in re publica uiros, et doctissimos homines
 non nimis in re publica uersatos, multos commemorare
 possumus: qui uero utraque re excelleret, ut et doctrinae
 studiis et regenda ciuitate princeps esset, quis facile praeter
 hunc inueniri potest? 20

72 W

1–21 *Thphr. no. 591 FHS&G* 1–6 *Panaetius F 48 van Straaten = T 103 Alesse* 5–12 *Dicaearch. no. 86 Mirhady = F 67 Wehrli; Heraclid. Pont. F 143 Wehrli* 4 *Panaetio] cf. 110.7* 12–21 228 *T 8 FGrH* 13 *supra] 2.64–6 = 53.17–46* 14–16 *mirabiliter—produxit] cf. 121.4–6*

7 ab hac familia *dett.*: ad hanc familia V: ab Academia *Haupt, sed cf. 1.55*
 ab illa Platonis familia 14–15 *eruditorum quaeodioque (corr. in hodieque A²)V, corr. edd.* 18 *nimis Victorius: minus V*

Praefectus Bibliothecae Alexandrinae

testimonia de bibliotheca Alexandrina et de origine versionis LXX interpretum collecta sunt apud P. Wendland, *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula*, 1900, 96–166; R. Tramontano, *La Lettera di Aristeia a Filocrate*, 1931, 165*–208*; R. Helm ad Hieronymum, *Interpretatio Chronicorum Eusebii* Ol. 124,2–3 (GCS 24 p. 370.43–371.20); A. Pelletier, *La Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate (= Sources Chrétiennes, 89)*, 1962, 78–98; etiam cf. A.-M. Denis, 'La Lettre d'Aristée,' in: *Introduction aux Pseudo-épigraphiques Grecs d'Ancien Testament (= Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica, 1)*, 1970, 105–10

MARCUS: Not really, except by him (Dio) whom I just mentioned and later by a great man who was among the foremost in learning, Panaetius. For the old (Stoics) discussed the state intelligently, in so far as theory goes, but not, as here, with a view to things useful for the people and citizens. Those things have their origin more in this school led by Plato. Afterwards Aristotle clarified the whole topic of politics in discussion, as did Heraclides of Pontus, who also got his start from the same Plato. And Theophrastus, who was instructed by Aristotle, did indeed spend his time, as you know, in this kind of subject, and Dicaearchus, who was taught by the same Aristotle, did not neglect this area of thought and study either. Afterwards the well-known man from Phalerum whom I have mentioned earlier, Demetrius, a student of Theophrastus, admirably led learning out of the shady retreat and leisure of the erudite not just into the sunlight and the dust but into conflict itself and the line of battle: we can mention many men of modest learning who have occupied important positions in the state and many very learned men not too well at home in affairs of state, but whom besides this man can one readily find who is so strong on both scores that he is first both in the pursuit of learning and in ruling the state?

¹ Cicero has just said that on the topic of magistrates research has been done by Theophrastus, and even more carefully by Dio the Stoic.

Director of the Alexandrian Library

The testimonia on the Library of Alexandria and on the origin of the translation by the seventy interpreters have been collected by P. Wendland, *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula*, 1900, 96–166; R. Tramontano, *La Lettera di Aristeia a Filocrate*, 1931, 165*–208*; R. Helm on Hieronymus, *Translation of Eusebius' Chronological Canons* Ol. 124,2–3 (GCS 24 p. 370.43–371.20); A. Pelletier, *La Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate* (= *Sources Chrétiennes*, 89), 1962, 78–98; cp. also. A.-M. Denis, 'La Lettre d'Aristée,' in: *Introduction aux Pseudo-épigraphiques Grecs d'Ancien Testament* (= *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudo-epigraphica*, 1), 1970, 105–10

Bibliotheca Alexandrina

58A Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* p. 518 Dindorf (BT 329.3–8 Mosshammer)

17 W

Πτολεμαῖος οὗτος ὁ Φιλάδελφος πᾶσαν πανταχόθεν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, συμφορήσας βίβλον τῆς οἰκουμένης σπουδῇ τοῦ Φαληρέως Δημητρίου τρίτου νομοθέτου Ἀθηναίων, ἀνδρὸς παρ' Ἑλλησι σπουδαίου, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὴν Ἑβραίων γραφὴν, ὡς προτέτακται, τὴν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βιβλιοθήκην καθίστησιν ρλβ' ὀλυμπιάδι, ἥς πληρουμένης τελευτᾷ. δέκα μυριάδες βίβλων ἦσαν, ὡς τινὲς φασιν.

3 τρίτου νομοθέτου] cf. **20B.1**

58B Ioannes Tzetzes, *Prolegomena de comoedia Graeca*, Prooemium II (SA XIa II, 1.1A.32.2–11 Koster)

67 W

ὁ γὰρ ῥηθεὶς βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ἐκεῖνος, ἡ φιλοσοφωτάτη τῶ ὄντι καὶ θεία ψυχὴ, καλοῦ παντὸς καὶ θεάματος καὶ ἔργου καὶ λόγου τελῶν ἐπιθυμητῆς, ἐπεὶ διὰ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως καὶ γερουσίων ἐτέρων ἀνδρῶν δαπάναις βασιλικαῖς ἀπανταχόθεν τὰς βίβλους εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἤθροισε, δυσὶ βιβλιοθήκαις ταύτας ἀπέθετο, ὧν τῆς ἐκτὸς μὲν ἦν ἀριθμὸς τετρακισμύριαι δισχίλιαι ὀκτακόσiai, τῆς δ' ἔσω τῶν ἀνακτόρων καὶ βασιλείου βίβλων μὲν συμμιγῶν ἀριθμὸς τεσσεράκοντα μυριάδες, ἀπλῶν δὲ καὶ ἀμιγῶν βίβλων μυριάδες ἐννέα, ...

1–11 = VI Mb 5–13 Kaibel; scholion Plautinum in codice Vat. Lat. 11.469 (SA XIa, 1.1A p. 48.6–49.1 Koster); eadem paulo brevius in Anonymo Crameri (SA XIc, 1.1A p. 43.4–9 Koster = VI Pb 4–10 Kaibel = 228 T 6e FGrH)

The Alexandrian Library

- 58A** Georgius Syncellus, *Chronographical Selection* p. 518 Dindorf (BT 329.3–8 Mosshammer)

This Ptolemy Philadelphus brought together from all over the world every book, so to speak, through the exertions of Demetrius of Phalerum, third lawgiver of the Athenians, a man of great importance amongst the Greeks. Included were also the writings of the Hebrews, as mentioned above.¹ Thus he established the library in Alexandria in the 132nd Olympiad,² but while it was being stocked he died.³ There were, according to some, 100,000 books.

¹ Part of this paragraph on Ptolemy II Philadelphus is quoted in 64.

² I.e., 252/1–249/8. According to Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.8.11 (citing Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3.21.2; cp. 61.3–4), it was founded by Ptolemy I Soter.

³ In 246.

- 58B** Joannes Tzetzes, *Introduction to Greek Comedy*, Proem II (SA XIa II, 1.1A.32.2–11 Koster)

For the said king Ptolemy,¹ a truly most philosophic and divine spirit, was a confirmed lover of everything beautiful to sight and in deed and in word. Thus he collected through the services of Demetrius of Phalerum and other elderly men the books from all over the world in Alexandria, defraying expenses out of the royal funds, and deposited them in two libraries. Of these two the one outside numbered 42,800 books, the one inside the royal palace² 400,000 books of a composite nature and 90,000 books of a simple and non-composite nature ...³

¹ I.e., Ptolemy II Philadelphus, mentioned by Tzetzes in the preceding sentence.

² The one outside was the Serapeum, the one inside the Museum.

³ Tzetzes adds that these figures were computed later on by Callimachus in his *pinakes*.

Libri sacri Iudaeorum

59 Aristeas, *Epistula ad Philocratem* 9–11; 28; 29–32; 301–3; 308–9; 312–7 (BT 3.11–4.9; 10.11–12; 10.19–12.5; 79.23–80.11; 81.8–15; 82.6–83.14 Wendland)

- 66 W 9 κατασταθείς ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως βιβλιοθήκης
 Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐχρηματίσθη πολλὰ διάφορα
 πρὸς τὸ συναγαγεῖν, εἰ δυνατόν, ἅπαντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν
 οἰκουμένην βιβλία, καὶ ποιούμενος ἀγορασμοὺς καὶ
 μεταγραφὰς ἐπὶ τέλος ἤγαγεν, ὅσον ἐφ’ ἑαυτῷ, τὴν τοῦ 5
 10 βασιλέως πρόθεσιν. παρόντων γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐρωτηθεῖς,
 πόσαι τινὲς μυριάδες τυγχάνουσι βιβλίων, εἶπεν· “ὑπὲρ
 τὰς εἴκοσι, βασιλεῦ· πληρώσω δ’ ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ πρὸς τὸ
 πληρωθῆναι πεντήκοντα μυριάδας τὰ λοιπά. προσ-
 αγγέλλεται δέ μοι καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμιμα μεταγραφῆς 10
 11 ἄξια καὶ τῆς παρὰ σοὶ βιβλιοθήκης εἶναι.” “τί τὸ κωλύον
 οὖν,” εἶπεν, “ἐστὶ σε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; πάντα γὰρ ὑπο-
 τέτακταί σοι τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν.” ὁ δὲ Δημήτριος εἶπεν·
 “ἐρμηνείας προσδεῖται· χαρακτῆρσι γὰρ ἰδίῳις κατὰ τὴν
 Ἰουδαίων χρῶνται, καθάπερ Αἰγύπτιοι τῇ τῶν γραμ- 15
 μάτων θέσει, καθὸ καὶ φωνὴν ἰδίαν ἔχουσιν· ὑπολαμ-
 βάνονται Συριακῇ χρῆσθαι, τὸ δ’ οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλ’ ἕτερος
 τρόπος.”
 μεταλαβὼν δὲ ἕκαστα ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπε γραφῆναι πρὸς
 τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅπως τὰ προειρημένα 20
 τελείωσιν λάβῃ. ...
 28 ὥς δὲ κατεπράχθη ταῦτα, τὸν Δημήτριον ἐκέλευσεν
 εἰσδοῦναι περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν βιβλίων ἀντιγραφῆς
 ... τῆς δὲ εἰσδόσεώς ἐστιν ἀντίγραφον τόδε·

1–11 228 T 6e FGrH 1–21 = (verbatim) Eus. PE 8.2.1–4 (GCS 8.1.421.3–16 Mras); (per paraphrasin) Jos. AJ 12.12–16 (3.74.22–75.16 Niese) 22–4 = Eus. PE 8.2.5 (GCS 8.1.421.18–19; 422.3–4 Mras); Jos. AJ 12.34; 35 (3.78.20–2; 79.4–5 Niese)

1 βιβλιοθήκης] βιβλιοθηκῶν Jos. 6 γὰρ O: om. cett.: οὖν Eus.
 8 πληρώσω] σπουδάσω Eus. 9–10 προσαγγέλλεται] προσήγγελλται
 Eus. 15 Ἰουδαίων] Ἰουδαίαν Eus. 23 ἀντιγραφῆς] ἀναγραφῆς
 Eus. Jos.

The Sacred Books of the Jews

59 Aristeas, *Letter to Philocrates* 9–11; 28; 29–32; 301–3; 308–9; 312–7 (*BT* 3.11–4.9; 10.11–12; 10.19–12.5; 79.23–80.11; 81.8–15; 82.6–83.14 Wendland)

9 When Demetrius of Phalerum was made head of the king's library,¹ he was furnished with large sums of money to collect, if possible, all the books in the world. He started buying (them) and having (them) transcribed, and he brought the king's project to
10 completion, as far as lay in his power. In fact, when asked in our presence just how many tens of thousands of books there were, he said: "More than twenty, sire. Within a short time, I will fill up the remainder so as to bring the total up to 500,000. It is reported to me that the law books of the Jews too deserve to be transcribed
11 and included in your library." "Well, then," (the king) said, "what is keeping you from doing that? For everything you need has been put at your disposal." Demetrius said: "A translation is needed. For in the Jews' country they use their own special characters, just as the Egyptians (use their own) writing system; accordingly they also have their own special spoken language. They are supposed to use the Syrian language,² but that is not true; (their language is a) different type."

After having been informed about all the details, the king said that the High Priest of the Jews³ should be written to in order that the project thus formulated should be accomplished. ...

28 After these orders had been executed,⁴ (the king) asked Demetrius to report on the transcription of the Jewish books ... a copy of the report reads as follows:

¹ I.e., Ptolemy II Philadelphus. The title 'Philadelphus' is not used in the *Letter* itself, but in 35 the king refers to a deed of Ptolemy I as "of our father's" and in 41 the High Priest refers to "the queen Arsinoe" as "his sister."

² I.e., Aramaic.

³ Eleazar.

⁴ 12–27 concern the Jewish prisoners of war taken by Ptolemy I, who live in Egypt as slaves. These are to be set free and their owners are to be compensated financially.

- 199 W 29 “Βασιλεῖ μεγάλῳ παρὰ Δημητρίου. προστάξαντός 25
σου, βασιλεῦ, περὶ τῶν ἀπολιπόντων εἰς τὴν συμπλή-
ρωσιν τῆς βιβλιοθήκης βιβλίων, ὅπως ἐπισυναχθῇ καὶ
τὰ διαπεπτωκότα τύχη τῆς προσηκούσης ἐπισκευῆς,
πεποιημένος οὐ παρέργως τὴν ἐν τούτοις ἐπιμέλειαν,
30 προσαναφέρω σοι. τὰ δὲ τοῦ νόμου τῶν Ἰουδαίων 30
βιβλία σὺν ἑτέροις ὀλίγοις τισὶν ἀπολείπει· τυγχάνει
γὰρ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι καὶ φωνῇ λεγόμενα, ἀμελέστε-
ρον δὲ καὶ οὐχ ὥς ὑπάρχει σεσήμανται, καθὼς ὑπὸ τῶν
εἰδόντων προσαναφέρεται· προνοίας γὰρ βασιλικῆς οὐ
31 τέτευχε. δέον δ’ ἐστὶ καὶ ταῦθ’ ὑπάρχειν παρὰ σοὶ 35
διηκριβωμένα διὰ τὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτεραν εἶναι καὶ
ἀκέραιον τὴν νομοθεσίαν ταύτην ὥς ἂν οὖσαν θείαν.
διὸ πόρρω γεγόνασιν οἵ τε συγγραφεῖς καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ τὸ
τῶν ἱστορικῶν πλῆθος τῆς ἐπιμνήσεως τῶν προειρη-
μένων βιβλίων καὶ τῶν κατ’ αὐτὰ πεπολιτευμένων καὶ 40
πολιτευομένων ἀνδρῶν, διὰ τὸ ἀγνήν τινα καὶ σεμνήν
εἶναι τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς θεωρίαν, ὥς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος ὁ
32 Ἀβδηρίτης. ἐὰν οὖν φαίνεται, βασιλεῦ, γραφήσεται
πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀποστεῖλαι τοὺς
μάλιστα καλῶς βεβιωκότας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους ὄντας 45
ἄνδρας, ἐμπείρους τῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν ἑαυτῶν, ἀφ’
ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἕξ, ὅπως τὸ σύμφωνον ἐκ τῶν πλειόνων
ἐξετάσαντες καὶ λαβόντες τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν
ἀκριβὲς ἀξίως καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τῆς σῆς
προαιρέσεως θῶμεν εὐσήμως. εὐτύχει διὰ παντός.” ... 50

- 66 W 301 μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ὁ Δημήτριος παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς
καὶ διελθὼν τὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ σταδίων ἀνάχωμα τῆς
θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν νῆσον καὶ διαβὰς τὴν γέφυραν καὶ

25–50 228 T 6e FGrH = Eus. PE 8.3.1–4 (GCS 8.1.422.7–24 Mras);
Jos. AJ 12.36–9 (3.79.5–24 Niese) = Demetrii Phalerei Ad Ptolemaeum
Aegypti-orum regem Epistula (EG 218.1–27 Hercher) 42 Hecat.
Abd. 264 F 23 FGrH; cf. 73 B 15 DK 51–64 Jos. AJ 12.103–5
(3.90.2–11 Niese)

26 ἀπολιπόντων codd.: ἀπολειφθέντων Eus.: ἀπολειπόντων
Mendelssohn 30 σοι. τὰ δὲ codd. Eus.: σοι τάδε. Thackeray 37
θείαν] θεοῦ Jos. 40 αὐτὰ Wendland: αὐτὰς codd. 40–1 καὶ →

29 “To the Great King from Demetrius. In compliance with your
 order, Sire, with respect to the books that are wanting for complet-
 ing the library, (i.e., to ensure) that (these) will be collected and
 that the volumes that have fallen apart will be repaired as re-
 quired, I have made it my principal concern to attend to these mat-
 30 ters and report to you accordingly. The books on the law of the
 Jews with a few others are still missing; for it so happens that
 these are put in Hebrew characters and language, and have been
 recorded in written signs rather carelessly and not as well as is
 possible, as is reported by the experts. For they have not received
 31 a king’s provident care. It is fitting that these books too be avail-
 able to you, in an accurately established text, because this code of
 laws is both quite philosophical and uncontaminated, being as it
 is, so to speak, of divine origin. That is why writers and poets and
 the majority of the historians have refrained from mentioning the
 books cited above, as have those (men) who have conducted their
 government in accordance with them and are (still) doing so, be-
 cause the doctrine in them is a holy and august one, as Hecataeus
 32 of Abdera says. If therefore it so pleases, Sire, the High Priest in
 Jerusalem shall be written to, (and he will be asked) to send those
 men who have more than others lived an exemplary life and are of
 an advanced age, experienced in matters relating to their own law,
 six men from each tribe, in order that thus by careful examination
 we may distill from the majority what they agree upon and estab-
 lish an accurate translation, in a way worthy both of these matters
 and of your chosen policy. Fare you well always.”⁵ ...

301 Three days later⁶ Demetrius took them along with him, passed
 along the seven stades’ dam in the sea, which led to the island,⁷
 crossed the bridge, and proceeded to the northern part, where he

⁵ The *Letter* goes on as follows: letter of Ptolemy to Eleazar and reply of Eleazar (33–46); magnificent gifts of Ptolemy to Eleazar (51–82); account of the visit of the Alexandrian envoys (including Aristeeas himself) to Jerusalem (83–171); arrival of the envoys and the Jewish elders in Alexandria and their reception by Ptolemy (172–186); a banquet lasting several days; Ptolemy discusses matters of public morality with the Jewish elders (187–300).

⁶ I.e., after the banquet; see note 5.

⁷ I.e., Pharos.

- προσελθὼν ὡς ἐπὶ τὰ βόρεια μέρη, συνέδριον ποιησάμε-
 νος εἰς κατεσκευασμένον οἶκον παρὰ τὴν ἡϊόνα, 55
 διαπρεπῶς ἔχοντα καὶ πολλῆς ἡσυχίας ἔφεδρον, παρε-
 κάλει τοὺς ἄνδρας τὰ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐπιτελεῖν,
 302 παρόντων, ὅσα πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν ἔδει, καλῶς. οἱ δὲ
 ἐπετέλουν ἕκαστα σύμφωνα ποιοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς
 ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς· τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῆς συμφωνίας γινόμενον 60
 πρεπόντως ἀναγραφῆς οὕτως ἐτύγχανε παρὰ τοῦ
 303 Δημητρίου. καὶ μέχρι μὲν ὥρας ἐνάτης τὰ τῆς συνεδρίας
 ἐγίνετο· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος θεραπείαν
 ἀπελύοντο γίνεσθαι, ...
- 308 τελείωσιν δὲ ὅτε ἔλαβε, συναγαγὼν ὁ Δημήτριος τὸ 65
 πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὸν τόπον, οὗ καὶ τὰ τῆς
 ἐρμηνείας ἐτελέσθη, παρανέγνω πᾶσι, παρόντων καὶ
 τῶν διερμηνευσάντων, οἵτινες μεγάλης ἀποδοχῆς καὶ
 παρὰ τοῦ πλήθους ἔτυχον, ὡς ἂν μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν
 309 παραίτιοι γεγονότες. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸν Δημήτριον 70
 ἀποδεξάμενοι παρεκάλεσαν μεταδοῦναι τοῖς ἡγου-
 μένοις αὐτῶν, μεταγράψαντα τὸν πάντα νόμον. ...
- 312 προσφωνηθέντων δὲ καὶ τούτων τῷ βασιλεῖ μεγάλως
 ἐχάρη· τὴν γὰρ πρόθεσιν, ἣν εἶχεν, ἀσφαλῶς ἔδοξε
 τετελειῶσθαι. παρανεγνώσθη δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πάντα, καὶ 75
 λίαν ἐξεθαύμασε τὴν τοῦ νομοθέτου διάνοιαν. καὶ πρὸς
 τὸν Δημήτριον εἶπε· “πῶς τηλικούτων συντετελεσμένων
 οὐδεὶς ἐπεβάλετο τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἢ ποιητικῶν ἐπι-
 313 μνησθῆναι;” ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔφη· “διὰ τὸ σεμνὴν εἶναι τὴν
 νομοθεσίαν καὶ διὰ θεοῦ γεγονέναι· καὶ τῶν ἐπιβαλλο- 80
 μένων τινὲς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πληγέντες τῆς ἐπιβολῆς
 314 ἀπέστησαν.” καὶ γὰρ ἔφησεν ἀκηκοέναι Θεοπόμπου,
 διότι μέλλων τινὰ τῶν προηρμηνευμένων ἐπισφαλέςτε-

65–72 *Jos. AJ* 12.107–8 (3.90.18–25 Niese) 73–99 = *Eus. PE* 8.5.7–10 (*GCS* 8.1.426.6–427.2 *Mras*); *Jos. AJ* 12.110–4 (3.91.8–92.3 Niese) = 228 *T 6e FGrH* 73–95 *similiter* *Leo Grammaticus, Chronographia* 49.21–50.17 *Bekker* (*CSHB*) = *Georgius Monachus, Chronicon breve* 104.2 (*PG* 110.348.18–34 *De Muralto*) = *Theodosius Melitenus, Chronographia* 42.14–26 *Tafel*; *Georgius Cedrenus, Historiarum Compendium* 165B–C (*CSHB* 1.289.18–290.11 *Bekker*) = *Symeon Logotheta in Chronico Cod. Reg.* 1712 (*An. Par.* 1.14.25–34 *Cramer*) 82 Θεοπόμπου] *Theopomp.* 115 *T 11 FGrH* (= *Jos. AJ* 12.111–2) →

established working sessions in a house prepared for that purpose near the beach, excellently furnished and located in a very quiet spot. There he invited the men to accomplish the translations, anything they might possibly need for their work being at their command. And they accomplished each (of the translations),
 302 achieving agreement among themselves through discussion. The
 (text which was) produced through agreement was thus written
 303 out in a fitting manner under the direction of Demetrius. The sessions lasted until the ninth hour; after that they broke up to take care of their bodily needs ...⁸

308 When (the translation) had been finished, Demetrius assembled the Jewish people in the same place where the translation had been carried out, and read it aloud to all, in the presence of the translators. The translators met with great approbation from the people, who believed that they (the translators) had been instrumental in accomplishing a project of great benefit. (The people)
 309 received Demetrius in the same manner, asking him to have a full copy of the law made and to put it at the disposal of their leaders.⁹ ...

312 When this had also been reported to the king, he was very glad indeed. For the project he had set himself appeared to have been successfully accomplished. The entire translation was read aloud to him too, and he very much admired the intellect of the law-giver. And he said to Demetrius: "How is it possible that, when there was a composition of this magnitude and importance, none of the historians or poets took the trouble to mention it?"
 313 Demetrius replied: "That is because of the solemn nature of the legislation and its divine origin. As a matter of fact, some of those who did undertake to do so, were struck by the god and abandoned the enterprise." By way of explanation, he said he had actually heard Theopompus tell him that he had been disturbed in his
 314 mind for more than thirty days, when he was rather imprudently

⁸ The daily routine is described after this, with the interpreters paying their respects to the King each morning and performing their ablutions in the sea (304–7).

⁹ The representatives of the Jewish community decide that the text of the Law should from that moment on not be altered in any way (310–11).

78 ποιητικῶν *OTGI*: ποιητικῶς *KH*: ποιητῶν *Jos. Eus.* 82 Θεοπόμπου *Eus. Jos. Cedr. Theod.*: Θεοπέμπτου *codd. Mon. Zon. Sym.*: Θεόπεμπον *Leo*

- ρον ἐκ τοῦ νόμου προσιστορεῖν ταραχὴν λάβοι τῆς
 διανοίας πλεῖον ἡμερῶν τριάκοντα· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἄνεσιν 85
 ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τὸν θεὸν σαφὲς αὐτῷ γενέσθαι, τίνος
 315 χάριν τὸ συμβαῖνόν ἐστι. δι' ὀνείρου δὲ σημανθέντος,
 ὅτι τὰ θεῖα βούλεται περιεργασάμενος εἰς κοινούς
 ἀνθρώπους ἐκφέρειν, ἀποσχόμενον δὲ οὕτως ἀποκατα-
 316 στῆναι. “καὶ παρὰ Θεοδέκτου δὲ τοῦ τῶν τραγωδιῶν 90
 ποιητοῦ μετέλαβον ἐγώ, διότι παραφέρειν μέλλοντός τι
 τῶν ἀναγεγραμμένων ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ πρὸς τι δρᾶμα τὰς
 ὅψεις ἀπεγλαυκώθη· καὶ λαβὼν ὑπόνοιαν, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτ'
 αὐτῷ τὸ σύμπτωμα γέγονεν, ἐξιλασάμενος τὸν θεὸν ἐν
 95 πολλαῖς ἡμέραις ἀποκατέστη.”
 317 μεταλαβὼν δὲ ὁ βασιλεύς, καθὼς προεῖπον, περὶ
 τούτων τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Δημητρίου, προσκυνήσας ἐκέλευσε
 μεγάλην ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖσθαι τῶν βιβλίων καὶ
 συντηρεῖν ἄγνῳς.

90–5 *Theodect. T 17 TrGF*

breviter eadem fere narrant Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, Catechesis IV De decem dogmatibus 34 (PG 33.497.5–9; 15–19 Migne); Epiphanius Constantiensis, De mensuribus et ponderibus 9–11 (168.256–171.329 Moutsoulas), ubi Δημητρίῳ τινὶ τῷ Φαλαρηνῷ legitur; Epiphanius Constantiensis, De LXX Interpretibus 373^a–376^b (PG 43.373.1–376.18 Migne); Ioannes Zona-ras, Epitome Historiarum 4.16 (1.307.21–310.5 Dindorf); Synopsis Chronice 18.9–11 (BGMA 7.18.9–11 Sathas); cf. Cosmas Indicopleustes, Topographia Christiana 12 460B, ubi παρὰ Τρύφωνος τοῦ Φαληρέως dicitur

84 λαβεῖν] λάβοι *Eus.* 85 ἄνεσιν] αἵτησιν *Eus.* 87 σημανθέντος] μαθόντος *Eus. ION* 96–7 περὶ τούτων τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Δ.] περὶ τῶν →

*60 Aristobulus ap. Eusebium, *Praeparatio evangelica* 13.2.1–2 (GCS 8.2.190.16–191.7 Mras)

- ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ προσπε-
 1 φωνημένων· “φανερὸν ὅτι κατηκολούθησεν ὁ Πλάτων
 τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ καὶ φανερός ἐστι περιειρ-
 γασμένος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ. διηρμήνευται γὰρ πρὸ
 Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως δι' ἐτέρων, πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάν- 5
 δρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως, τά τε κατὰ τὴν ἐξαγω-
 γὴν τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τῶν Ἑβραίων, ἡμετέρων δὲ πολι-

about to add a record of some passages from the law which had already been translated. During a lucid interval he (Theopompus) had tried to appease the god (in order) that it might be made clear
 315 to him what was the reason of the thing happening to him. When it had been indicated to him through a dream that in wanting to divulge divine matters to common people he was overstepping his boundaries, he abandoned his intention and so recovered his reason.
 316 “I was also told by the tragedian Theodectes that, when he was about to introduce into a drama of his one of the things written down in the Bible, he suffered an attack of glaucoma of the eyes; and, having come to suspect that this was the reason he was affected by the disorder, he recovered from his illness only after having propitiated the god over many days.”

317 When the king had heard, as I said earlier, what Demetrius had to say on this matter, he showed deep respect for the books and gave orders that great care should be taken of them and that they should be preserved with due reverence.¹⁰

¹⁰ After this the interpreters are sent back to Jerusalem with gifts for Eleazar (318–21).

τοῦ Δ. *codd.*: περὶ τούτων τὰ περὶ (παρὰ *Cobet*) τοῦ Δ. *Eus. BION*: τὰῦτα παρὰ Δ. *Jos.*

***60** Aristobulus in Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* 13.12.1–2 (GCS 8.2.190.16–191.7 Mras)

From Aristobulus' address to King Ptolemy:

1 “It is obvious that Plato followed our legislation and he obviously studied all its details closely. For before Demetrius of Phalerum—before the conquest by Alexander and by the Persians that is¹—a translation had been made by others of the exodus out of Egypt of the Hebrews, our fellow-citizens, and of the glory of

τῶν, καὶ ἡ τῶν γεγονότων ἀπάντων αὐτοῖς ἐπιφάνεια καὶ
 κράτησις τῆς χώρας καὶ τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐπεξή- 10
 γησις, ὡς εὐδηλον εἶναι τὸν προειρημένον φιλόσοφον
 εἰληφέναι πολλά· γέγονε γὰρ πολυμαθής, καθὼς καὶ
 Πυθαγόρας πολλά τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν μετενέγκας εἰς τὴν
 2 ἑαυτοῦ δογματοποιίαν κατεχώρισεν. ἡ δ' ὅλη ἐρμηνεία
 τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος
 Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως, σοῦ δὲ προγόνου, προσενεγ- 15
 καμένου μείζονα φιλοτιμίαν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως
 πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων."

2–17 *Aristobul. F 2 (PVTG 3.221.14–222.23 Denis)* 2–13
 δογματοποιίαν = *Aristobul. ap. Clem. Al. Strom. 1.22.150.1–3 (GCS*
2.92.27–93.10 Stählin-Früchtel) [= *Cl.*], *quod iterum sub nomine*
Clementis ab Eusebio laudatur PE 9.6.6–8 (GCS 8.1.493.7–18 *Mras*) [= *Eus.*]
 13–17 cf. 61

2 φανερόν—κατηκολούθησεν] κατηκολούθηκε δὲ καὶ *Cl. Eus. (sine*
καὶ) 4 τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ] τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ λεγομένων *Cl. Eus.* || γὰρ] δὲ *Cl.*
Eus. 5 τοῦ Φαληρέως *om. Cl. Eus.* || δι' ἐτέρων] ὑφ' ἐτέρων *Cl. Eus.:*
 ὑφ' ἐτέρου *Cl. L* 6 καὶ *del. Wilamowitz* 10 ὡς] ὥστε *Cl.*
Eus. 13–17 κατεχώρισεν—τούτων *om. Cl. Eus.*

61

Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.22.148.1 (GCS 2.92.5–9
 Stählin-Früchtel)

67 W

... ἐρμηνευθῆναι δὲ τὰς γραφὰς τὰς τε τοῦ νόμου καὶ
 τὰς προφητικὰς ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἑβραίων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν
 Ἑλλάδα γλῶττάν φασιν ἐπὶ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου τοῦ
 Λάγου ἢ ὡς τινες ἐπὶ τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου ἐπικληθέντος, τὴν
 5 μεγίστην φιλοτιμίαν εἰς τοῦτο προσενεγκαμένου,
 Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως [καὶ] τὰ περὶ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν
 ἀκριβῶς πραγματευσαμένου·

1–7 cf. 60.13–17

6 καὶ *om. Aristob. (60.16)*

62

Tertullianus, *Apologeticum* 18.5 (CC 1.1.118.24–119.2
 Dekkers)

67 W

Ptolemaeus, quem Philadelphum supernominant, erudit-
 issimus rex et omnis litteraturae sagacissimus, cum studio

- all that has happened to them, of the conquest of the country² and of the exegesis of the entire legislation; therefore, it is evident that the aforementioned philosopher has borrowed many things. For he was a man of great knowledge, just as Pythagoras too has taken over many things from us and given them a place in his own doctrine. But the entire translation of all books containing the law (was made) during the reign of the king called Philadelphus, your ancestor,³ who contributed quite munificently to the project, with Demetrius of Phalerum managing everything connected with it.”

¹ This is explained as a *hysteron proteron*: the conquest of Egypt by Artaxerxes III in 341 preceded that by Alexander in 332 B.C.

² I.e., the Promised Land.

³ The quotation is from “the first (book) of the address to Philometor”; this appears to be Ptolemy VI Philometor (180–145 B.C.).

- 61 Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.22.148.1 (GCS 2.92.5–9 Stählin-Früchtel)

... the writings both of the law and of the prophets were translated, they say, from the Hebrew language into the Greek tongue during (the reign of) king Ptolemy, the son of Lagus,¹ or, as others say, during that of the (Ptolemy) called Philadelphus, who was most munificent in contributing funds to the project, Demetrius of Phalerum managing everything connected with the translation in a painstaking manner.

¹ I.e., Ptolemy I Soter. This is one of the very few texts which date the translation to the reign of Ptolemy I; cp. Johannes Malalas, *Chronography* V 83^a p. 196 Dindorf.

- 62 Tertullian, *Apology* 18.5 (CC 1.1.118.24–119.2 Dekkers)

Ptolemy, who had the surname Philadelphus, was the most erudite king and the most acute in all literature. He aspired, I

188 W bibliothecarum Pisistratum, opinor, aemularetur, inter
cetera memoriarum, quibus aut uetustas aut curiositas
5 aliqua ad famam patrocিনabatur, ex suggestu Demetrii
Phalerei, grammaticorum tunc probatissimi, cui praefect-
uram mandauerat, libros a Iudaeis quoque postulauit,
proprias atque uernaculas litteras, quas soli habebant.

2-3 studio—aemularetur] cf. *Isid. Orig.* 6.3.5 5-6 228 *T 6e et 10*
FGrH 6 grammaticorum] cf. 147.6-7 probatissimi] v. *ad* 17.8

2 *rex et omnis Modius*: rexit omni *F*: et omnis *vulg.*

63 Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 2.45-7 (5.60.2-15 Niese)

67 W 45 ὁ δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Φιλάδελφος ἐπικληθεὶς
οὐ μόνον εἴ τινες ἦσαν αἰχμάλωτοι παρ' αὐτῷ τῶν
ἡμετέρων πάντας ἀπέδωκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χρήματα
πολλάκις ἐδωρήσατο καὶ τὸ μέγιστον ἐπιθυμητῆς ἐγέν-
ετο τοῦ γνῶναι τοὺς ἡμετέρους νόμους καὶ ταῖς τῶν 5
46 ἱερῶν γραφῶν βίβλοις ἐντυχεῖν. ἔπεμψε γοῦν ἀξιῶν
ἄνδρας ἀποσταλῆναι τοὺς ἐρμηνεύσοντας αὐτῷ τὸν
νόμον καὶ τοῦ γραφῆναι ταῦτα καλῶς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν
ἐπέταξεν οὐ τοῖς τυχοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ Δημήτριον τὸν Φαλη-
ρέα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Ἀριστέα, τὸν μὲν παιδεία τῶν 10
47 καθ' ἑαυτὸν διαφέροντα Δημήτριον, τοὺς δὲ τὴν τοῦ σώ-
ματος αὐτοῦ φυλακὴν ἐγκεχειρισμένους, ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπι-
μελείας ταύτης ἔταξεν, οὐκ ἂν δήπου τοὺς νόμους καὶ
τὴν πάτριον ἡμῶν φιλοσοφίαν ἐπιθυμήσας ἐκμαθεῖν, εἰ
τῶν χρωμένων αὐτοῖς ἀνδρῶν κατεφρόνει καὶ μὴ λῖαν 15
ἐθαύμαζεν.

9-10 228 *T 6e FGrH* 10-11 τὸν—Δημήτριον] v. *ad* 17.8

1 αὐτὸν *ed. pr.*: αὐτὰ *L* 11 διαφέροντα *ed. pr.*: διαφερόντων *L*

***64** Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* p. 517 Dindorf
(BT 328.16-22 Mosshammer)

οἱ δὲ θεοφιλεῖς ὄντες καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἠνωμένοι κατὰ
συζυγίας διαιρεθέντες ἐν οβ' ταῖς ὅλαις ἡμέραις
ὁμοφώνως ἐπιπνοία θεοῦ τὴν ὅλην Ἑβραίων φωνὴν

think, to be the equal of Pisistratus in his eagerness for books.¹ In addition to the other documents which age and a certain curiosity recommended for fame, he also asked the Jews for books, their own literature in their native language, which they alone possessed; (and he did this) on the recommendation of Demetrius of Phalerum, the most esteemed of the philologists of that time, to whom he had entrusted the directorship.

¹ Pisistratus was tyrant of Athens. For his reputation as a "Greek book collector" see R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* I, 1968, 7.

63 Josephus, *Against Apion* 2.45–7 (5.60.2–15 Niese)

- 45 The Ptolemy who came after him,¹ called Philadelphus, not only gave back all of our men whom he had as prisoners of war, but also often made donations of money and, most important of all, proved to be desirous of getting to know our laws and of becoming acquainted with the books containing the holy scriptures.
- 46 He did, at any rate, send a request that men would be dispatched to translate for him the law, and in order to ensure an accurate transcription of the text, he entrusted the supervision not to just anybody, but as supervisors of the project appointed Demetrius
- 47 of Phalerum, Andreas and Aristas,² Demetrius being one of the most learned men of his time, the other two being his own bodyguards. Surely he would not have conceived a desire to get to know in all detail our laws and the philosophy handed down by our fathers, if he despised the men who put these into practice rather than admiring them very much.

¹ Ptolemy I, son of Lagus, mentioned in 44.

² This information is derived from Aristas' *Letter to Philocrates* (59). There Andreas and Aristas are mentioned by the King in his letter to Eleazar as being the persons who bring him the gifts from the King and will negotiate with him about the sacred books (40).

***64** Georgius Syncellus, *Chronographical Selection* p. 517 Dindorf (BT 328.16–22 Mosshammer)

Being loved by god and united in spirit, they made,¹ divided into pairs, a divinely inspired uniform translation of the entire (prophetic) utterance of the Hebrews in a total of 72 days. When it

μετέφρασαν. ἥς ἐπαναγνωσθείσης Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ
 Φιλαδέλφῳ καὶ τοῖς περὶ αὐτὸν σοφοῖς Δημητρίῳ τῷ 5
 Φαληρεῖ παρ' Ἑλλησιν ἀνδρὶ σπουδαίῳ καὶ πολυ-
 μαθεῖ, Μενεδήμῳ τε φιλοσόφῳ καὶ ἑτέροις ἀνθοῦσι τῷ
 τηνικαῦτα, ὡμολογήθη μόνη θεόπνευστος εἶναι παρὰ
 πᾶσαν γραφὴν ἐγνωσμένην αὐτοῖς.

1-9 cf 59.73-95, ubi v. testimonia, quae omnia Menedemum eis quae
 illic narrantur adfuisse dicunt 6-7 ἀνδρὶ—πολυμαθεῖ] v. ad 17.8

65 Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 1.215-8 (5.38.20-39.2 Niese)

- 215 ἀρκοῦσι δὲ ὅμως εἰς τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἀρχαιότητος
 αἱ τε Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Χαλδαίων καὶ Φοινίκων ἀναγραφαὶ
 216 πρὸς ἐκείναις τε τοσοῦτοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων συγγραφεῖς· ἔτι
 δὲ πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις Θεόφιλος καὶ Θεόδοτος καὶ
 Μνασέας καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης καὶ Ἑρμογένης Εὐήμερός τε 5
 καὶ Κόνων καὶ Ζωπυρίων καὶ πολλοὶ τινες ἄλλοι τάχα,
 οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε πᾶσιν ἐντετύχηκα τοῖς βιβλίοις, οὐ
 201 W 217 παρέργως ἡμῶν ἐμνημονεύκασιν. οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν
 εἰρημένων ἀνδρῶν τῆς μὲν ἀληθείας τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς
 πραγμάτων διήμαρτον, ὅτι μὴ ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἡμῶν βίβλοις 10
 ἐνέτυχον, κοινῶς μέντοι περὶ τῆς ἀρχαιότητος ἅπαντες
 218 μεμαρτυρήκασιν, ὑπὲρ ἧς τὰ νῦν λέγειν προεθέμην. ὁ
 μέντοι Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος καὶ Φίλων ὁ πρεσβύτερος
 καὶ Εὐπόλεμος οὐ πολὺ τῆς ἀληθείας διήμαρτον. οἷς
 συγγιγνώσκειν ἄξιον· οὐ γὰρ ἐνῆν αὐτοῖς μετὰ πάσης 15

was publicly read aloud to Ptolemy Philadelphus and the learned men of his circle, (i.e.) Demetrius of Phalerum, a worthy man of great learning among the Greeks, and the philosopher Menedemus² and others flourishing at that time, all agreed that (this translation) alone was divinely inspired as compared to all writing known to them.³

¹ This passage is part of a description of the translation of the sacred books; Demetrius has not been mentioned yet.

² In Aristeas' *Letter to Philocrates* 201 (= Jos., *AJ* 12.101) Menedemus is said to be present at the banquet given to the Jewish elders (see note 5 to 59), not at the reading of the translation as here.

³ After this there follows a short excerpt from Josephus; it concerns Theopompus and Theodectes (cp. 59.73–95), and the embassy of Aristeas and Andreas to Eleazar in Jerusalem; after that the passage printed as 58A.

65 Josephus, *Against Apion* 1.215–8 (5.38.20–39.2 Niese)

215 However, our antiquity is sufficiently established by the Egyptian, Chaldaean, and Phoenician records, not to mention the numerous Greek historians. In addition to those already cited,¹
 216 Theophilus, Theodotus, Mnaseas, Aristophanes, Hermogenes, Euhemerus, Conon, Zopyrion, and maybe many others—for I am not acquainted with all (relevant) writings—have made more than
 217 a passing mention of us. The majority of the men just mentioned have utterly failed to grasp the true state of our history from its beginning, because they have not become acquainted with our sacred books. They have, however, all without exception testified to our antiquity, which is what I propose to speak about here.
 218 Demetrius of Phalerum, it is true, and Philo the elder and Eupolemus did not miss the truth by much; and in their case it is only fair to make allowances, for it was not possible for them to follow our

ἀκριβείας τοῖς ἡμετέροις γράμμασι παρακολουθεῖν.

1–16 = *Eus. PE* 9.42.1–3 (*GCS* 8.1.553.16–554.5 *Mras*) = 737 *F* 1
FGrH 4 *Theophilus* 733 *T* 1 *FGrH* || *Theodotus* 732 *T* 1 *FGrH*
 1–12 *Euhemerus* *T* 79A *Winiarczyk* 3–8 *Euhemerus* 63 *F* 11 = *Konon*
 26 *F* 4 *FGrH* 5 *Mnaseas* *F* 34 *FHG III* 155 || *Hermogenes* 851 *FGrH*
 12–16 228 *F* 51 *FGrH* = *Philo* 729 *T* 1 *FGrH* = *Eupolemus* 723 *T* 3
FGrH 13 *Demetrius* 722 *T* 1 *FGrH*

2 Αἰγυπτίων] Σύρων *Eus.* 4 Θεόδοτος *L Eus.*: theodorus *Lat.* 6
 Κόνων *L*: cinun *Lat.*: Κόμων *Eus.* 12 ἥς] οὗ *Eus.* 13 Φαληρεὺς
seclus. Jacoby 14–15 οἷς—ἄξιον *om. Eus. BON*

66

Tertullianus, *Apologeticum* 19.5–6 (*CC* 1.1.121.11–22
 Dekkers)

- 5 haec quibus ordinibus probari possint, non tam difficile
 est nobis exponere, quam enorme, nec arduum, sed interim
 longum [dinumerare]. multis instrumentis cum digitorum
 supputatoriis gesticulis asserendum est, reseranda anti-
 quissimarum etiam gentium archiua, Aegyptiorum, Chald- 5
 6 aeorum, Phoenicum; aduocandi, per quos notitia submin-
 istrata est, aliqui Manethon Aegyptius et Berosus Chald-
 aeus, sed et Hieromus Phoenix, Tyrriorum rex; sectatores
 quoque ipsorum, Mendesius Ptolemaeus et Menander
 Ephesius et Demetrius Phalereus et rex Iuba et Apion et 10
 Thallus et, qui istos aut probat aut reuincit, Iudaeus
 Iosephus, antiquitatum Iudaicarum uernaculus uindex;

4–12 228 *F* 52 *FGrH* = 794 *F* 5c *FGrH* = *Thallus* 256 *T* 3 *FGrH* 7
Manetho 609 *T* 6b *FGrH* 7–8 *Berosus* 680 *T* 3 *FGrH* 8
Hieronymus 787 *T* 1b *FGrH* 9 *Ptolemaeus Mendesius* 611 *T* 2a
FGrH || *Menander* 783 *T* 2a *FGrH* 10 *Demetrius Phalereus*]
Demetrius 643 *T* 2 *FGrH* || *Apion* 616 *T* 12 *FGrH*

3 dinumerare *F*, *om. Vulg.*: secl. *Dekkers* 4 asserendum *F*:
 adsidendum *Vulg.* || reseranda (*F*) *dett.*: reseruanda *SPM* 7 aliqui *F*:
 alioquin *Vulg.* 7–8 *Berosus Chaldaeus Vulg.*: Hebraeus et Chaldaeus
F 8 *Hieromus Oehler*: Proemis *F*: Hieronimus *Vulg.* 9 ipsorum
SPM: eorum (*F*) *dett* 11 qui (*F*): si quis *Vulg.*

writings with complete accuracy.²

¹ Pythagoras (162–5), Theophrastus (167), Herodotus (168–71), Choerilus (172–5), Aristotle (176–82), Hecataeus of Abdera (183–204), Agatharchides (205–12). Josephus then comments upon the silence of Hieronymus of Cardia (213–14), which is surprising but does not really matter for the reasons mentioned in the text.

² Jacoby and Wehrli consider 65 and 66 as spurious. For 65, cp. the Demetrius who wrote *On the Kings in Judaea* (722 FGrH); and for 66, the Demetrius who wrote *On Egypt* (643 FGrH). In both cases Jacoby FGrH II b 653 on 228 F 51–2 considers a “Fälschung” more likely than a “Verwechselung”; Wehrli p. 87–8 on F 201–2 the opposite.

66 Tertullian, *Apology* 19.2.5–6 (CC 1.1.121.11–22 Dekkers)

- 5 To explain through what successive steps in time this (the antiquity of Moses) could be proved, is not just difficult for us but rather is an enormous task; nor is it an arduous task, it is just (that it is) too long for the moment. Many documents together with many finger movements for counting are needed for establishing the proof; archives of the most ancient nations must furthermore be opened, of the Egyptians, the Chaldaeans, the Phoenicians.
- 6 Certain persons must be summoned, through whom our knowledge is furnished, like Manetho from Egypt and Berosus the Chaldaean, but also Hieromus the Phoenician, king of the Tyrians; their followers too, Ptolemaeus from Mendes and Menander from Ephesus and Demetrius of Phalerum and king Juba and Apion and Thallus and the man who either confirms or refutes the aforementioned, Josephus the Jew, native protector of the Jewish antiquities.¹

¹ See note 2 to 65.

Relationes Variae

- *67 Plutarchus, *De tuenda sanitate praecepta* 24 135C (BT 1.278.16–22 Gärtner)

ἥκιστα δὴ τὴν ἀργίαν ὑγιεινὸν ὑποληπτέον, εἰ τὸ τῆς
 ὑγείας τέλος ἀπόλλυσι, καὶ οὐδ' ἀληθές ἐστι τὸ μᾶλλον
 ὑγιαίνειν τοὺς ἡσυχίαν ἄγοντας· οὔτε γὰρ Ξενοκράτης
 μᾶλλον διυγίαινε Φωκίωνος οὔτε Δημητρίου Θεό- 5
 φραστος, Ἐπίκουρόν τε καὶ τοὺς περὶ Ἐπίκουρον οὐδὲν
 ὤνησε πρὸς τὴν ὑμνουμένην σαρκὸς εὐστάθειαν ἢ
 πάσης φιλοτιμίαν ἐχούσης πράξεως ἀπόδρασις.

1–7 *Thphr. no. 26 FHS&G* 5–7 *Epicurus F 8 Usener p. 95.9–11*

4 διυγίαινε *O*: δι' ὑγείαν *cett.* 5 τε] δὲ *Sieveking*

- *68 Marcus Aurelius, *Ad se ipsum* 9.29 (BT 89.8–19 Dalfen)

1/2 χειμάρρους ἢ τῶν ὅλων αἰτία· πάντα φέρει. ὥς εὐτελῇ
 δὲ καὶ τὰ πολιτικὰ ταῦτα καί, ὥς οἴεται, φιλοσόφως
 3 πρακτικὰ ἀνθρώπια· μυξῶν μεστά. ἄνθρωπε, τί ποτε;
 4 ποίησον, ὃ νῦν ἡ φύσις ἀπαιτεῖ. ὀρμησον, ἐὰν διδῶται,
 5 καὶ μὴ περιβλέπου, εἴ τις εἴσεται. μὴ τὴν Πλάτωνος 5
 πολιτείαν ἔλπιζε, ἀλλὰ ἀρκοῦ, εἰ τὸ βραχύτατον πρό-
 εἰσι, καὶ τούτου αὐτοῦ τὴν ἔκβασιν, ὥς μικρόν τί ἐστι,
 6 διανοοῦ. δόγμα γὰρ αὐτῶν τίς μεταβάλλει; χωρὶς δὲ
 δογμάτων μεταβολῆς τί ἄλλο ἢ δουλεία στενόντων καὶ
 7 πείθεσθαι προσποιουμένων; ὕπαγε νῦν καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον 10
 καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Δημήτριον τὸν Φαληρέα μοι λέγε.
 ὄψομαι, εἰ εἶδον, τί ἡ φύσις ἤθελε, καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἐπαι-
 δαγώγησαν· εἰ δὲ ἐτραγώδησαν, οὐδεὶς με κατακέκρικε
 8 μιμεῖσθαι. ἀπλοῦν ἐστι καὶ αἰδῆμον τὸ φιλοσοφίας
 ἔργον· μή με ἄπαγε ἐπὶ σεμνοτυφίαν. 15

1 αἰτία] οὐσία *Reiske coll. 7.19* 1–3 ὥς—μεστά *post* διανοοῦ 8
colloc. Farquharson 5 εἴσεται *T*: οἴσεται *AD* 7 οὐ μικρόν *T* 11
 τὸν Φαληρέα *suspectum putat Schenkl coll. 8.25.2* 12 ὄψομαι *Stich*:
 ὄψονται *AT*: ἔψομαι *Wilamowitz*

Various Reports

- *67** Plutarch, *Rules for Preserving Health* 24 135C (BT 1.278.16–22 Gärtner)

Clearly then, one should not at all suppose inactivity to be healthy, if it ruins that which health is meant to accomplish, and it is not true either that those who keep quiet enjoy a better health. For Xenocrates did not keep his health better than Phocion,¹ nor Theophrastus than Demetrius, and running away from any activity smacking of ambition did not at all benefit Epicurus and his adherents with a view to their celebrated stability of bodily health.

¹ Phocion was a pupil of Xenocrates (Plu. *Phoc.* 4.2).

- *68** Marcus Aurelius, *To Himself* 9.29 (BT 89.8–19 Dalfen)

1 The matter of the whole is a river swollen in winter; it carries
 2 all before it. How insignificant are these homunculi with their
 politics and their philosophic—so they think—practices; full of
 3/4 snot they are. Man, what then? Do what nature requires of you
 here and now. Go to, if the opportunity is given you, and don't
 5 look around to see whether anyone will know. Do not hope for
 Plato's republic, but be content if you make a very small step for-
 6 ward, and realize that the result even of this is nothing great. For
 who changes their convictions? And without a change of conviction
 what else is there (for them) except a bondage of men who
 7 groan and (merely) pretend to listen to reason? Come on, talk to
 me of Alexander, Philip, and Demetrius of Phalerum. I will see
 whether they saw what nature willed, and went to school to her. If,
 on the other hand, they merely played their part on the world's
 8 stage, no one has condemned me to imitate them. The work of
 philosophy is simplicity and self-respect; do not try to lead me
 into vainglory.

*69 Ioannes Tzetzes, *Epistulae* 61 (BT 91.24–92.4 Leone)

προσαγορευθήτω καὶ εἴ τις τῶν ὑμετέρων ἡμῖν
 γνώριμος καὶ ὁ σὸς οἰκέτης Εὐστράτιος ὁ συντομώτερος
 καὶ ταχινώτερος Κελλέρου καὶ Ἰφίκλου, φρονιμώτερος
 δὲ Ὀδυσσέως καὶ Νέστορος, μνημονέστερος δὲ Ἰσο-
 κράτους τοῦ ῥήτορος καὶ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως καὶ 5
 εἴ τις τούτων ἐφεύρηται μνημονέστερος.

4–5 μνημονέστερος ... Φαληρέως] *Tzetzes Historiae* 9.927–35 (383.3–
 11 Leone)

1 ἡμῖν *Hansen*: ὑμῖν *codd.*

***69** Johannes Tzetzes, *Letters* 61 (BT 91.24–92.4 Leone)

Please convey my greetings also to anyone of yours who is known to us and especially to your servant Eustratius who is more to the point and more quick-witted than Cellerus and Iphicles, has more common sense than Odysseus and Nestor and has a better memory than Isocrates the orator, Demetrius of Phalerum and whoever has been found to have an even better memory than these.¹

¹ In his *Histories* 9.927–35 Tzetzes says that he has cited Demetrius instead of Theophrastus. There the point is that Isocrates and Theophrastus (no. 436.4c FHS&G) both were prolific writers who lived to a great age.

II. DICTA

de dictis Demetrii Phalerii repertis in vitis antiquis vel gnomologiis et similibus collectionibus vel aliis textibus vide

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.79 = **1.52–3**
- 2 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.82 = **1.112–13**
- 3 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.82 = **1.113–15**
- 4 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.82 = **1.115–16**
- 5 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.82 = **1.116–17**
- 6 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.82 = **1.118–19**
- 7 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.82 = **1.119–21**
- 8 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.82 = **1.121–3** =
no. 15
- 9 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.83 = **1.123–5**
- 10 Demetrius, *De Elocutione* 289 = **12.7–8**
- 11 Plutarchus, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* 189D
= **38.4–6**
- 12 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 253 = **70A**
- 13 Arethas, *Epistulae* 39 = **70B**
- 14 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 254 = **71**
- 15 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 255 = **72** = no. 8
- 16 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 256 = **73**
- 17 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 257 = **74**
- 18 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 258 = **75**
- 19 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 259 = **76**
- 20 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 260 = **77**
- 21 *Florilegium Monacense* no. 186 = **78**
- 22 *Florilegium Monacense* no. 188 = **79**
- 23 Polybius, *Historiae* 29.21 = **82A.6–21**
- 24 Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* 31.10 = **82B.4**

II. SAYINGS

For sayings of Demetrius of Phalerum found in biographies or gnomologies and similar collections or other texts, see

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.79 = 1.52–3
- 2 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.82 = 1.112–13
- 3 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.82 = 1.113–15
- 4 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.82 = 1.115–16
- 5 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.82 = 1.116–17
- 6 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.82 = 1.118–19
- 7 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.82 = 1.119–21
- 8 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.82 = 1.121–3 = no. 15
- 9 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.83 = 1.123–5
- 10 Demetrius, *On Style* 289 = 12.7–8
- 11 Plutarchus, *Sayings of Kings and Commanders* 189D = 38.4–6
- 12 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 253 = 70A
- 13 Arethas, *Letters* 39 = 70B
- 14 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 254 = 71
- 15 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 255 = 72 = no. 8
- 16 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 256 = 73
- 17 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 257 = 74
- 18 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 258 = 75
- 19 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 259 = 76
- 20 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 260 = 77
- 21 *Florilegium Monacense* no. 186 = 78
- 22 *Florilegium Monacense* no. 188 = 79
- 23 Polybius, *Histories* 29.21 = 82A.6–21
- 24 Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History* 31.10 = 82B.4

- 25 Plutarchus, *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 6 104B = **83.7–8**
- 26 Polybius, *Historiae* 10.24.7 = **90.14–17**
- 27 Strabo, *Geographica* 3.2.9 = **116A.17–20** = no. 29
- 28 Strabo, *Geographica* 3.2.9 = **116A.26–7** = no. 30
- 29 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 6.23 233E = **116B.5–7** = no. 27
- 30 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 6.23 233E = **116B.8–10** = no. 28
- 31 Rutilius Rupus, *De figuris* 1.1 = **129.7–11**
- 32 Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum* 2.6 = **133.37–8**
- 33 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 5.4 177E–178A = **143.19–22**
- 34 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 3.12.18 = **154**

cf. *Dicta septem sapientium* a Demetrio Phalereo collecta ap. Stobaeum, *Anthologium* 3.1.172 = **87**

cf. quae Photius de dictis a Stobaeo collectis dicit, *Bibliotheca* 167 114a14–115b17, ubi Demetrius inter philosophos a Stobaeo laudatos nominatur (114a30 [CB 2.155.21 Henry]) et de Demetrii dicto a Stobaeo, *Anthologium* 4.7.27, laudato vide **app. 38.1–6** (= no. 11 supra)

70A *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 253 (99.1–2 Sternbach)

1221 W

Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἔφη, ὥς οἱ <θυμοὶ καθάπερ οἱ> κύνες τυφλὰ τίκτουσι τὰ κριτήρια.

idem apophthegma Plutarcho attribuitur in Anton. 2.53 (PG 136.1133C.40–1 Migne), Max. 19 (PG 91.840.20–1 Combefis), Mel. Aug. 34.5, cod. Par. Gr. 1168 (= Exc. Par. 9 Sternbach), cod. Vat. Gr. 743 f. 48^r, Apostol. 12.53^b (CPG 2.555.6–7 Leutsch); sine nomine auctoris occurrit in Flor. Pal.-Vat. 196, Gnom. Bar. 220 (= Gnom. Byz. 255 Wachsmuth), Flor. Ottobon. 221, Nilus Mal. Cog. PG 79.1453C.41–2 Migne

1 θυμοὶ καθάπερ οἱ *suppl. Sternbach e ceteris sententiae testibus: om. cod. || οἱ θυμοὶ] οἱ θυμικοὶ Apostol.: οἱ τῷ θυμῷ νικώμενοι Pal.-Vat., Bar.: οἱ τῶν θυμῶν νικόμενοι Ottob.* 1–2 οἱ κύνες] αἱ κύνες *Anton., Max. in codd. Vat. Gr. 741 et 385, Mel., Exc. Par., Apost.: κύνες Pal.-* →

- 25 Plutarchus, *Condolence addressed to Apollonius* 6 104B = **83.7–8**
- 26 Polybius, *Histories* 10.24.7 = **90.14–17**
- 27 Strabo, *Geography* 3.2.9 = **116A.17–20** = no. 29
- 28 Strabo, *Geography* 3.2.9 = **116A.26–7** = no. 30
- 29 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 6.23 233E = **116B.5–7** = no. 27
- 30 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 6.23 233E = **116B.8–10** = no. 28
- 31 Rutilius Rupus, *On Figures* 1.1 = **129.7–11**
- 32 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* 2.6 = **133.37–8**
- 33 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 5.4 177E–178A = **143.19–22**
- 34 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.12.18 = **154**

cp. *Sayings of the Seven Wise Men* collected by Demetrius of Phalerum in Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.1.172 = **87**

cp. what Photius says about the sayings collected by Stobaeus, *Library* 167 114a14–115b17, where Demetrius is mentioned among the philosophers quoted by Stobaeus (114a30 [CB 2.155.21 Henry]) and see **app. 38.1–6** (= no. 11 above) about the saying of Demetrius quoted by Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 4.7.27

70A *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 253 (99.1–2 Sternbach)

Demetrius of Phalerum said that <fits of rage, like> dogs, make the senses blind.

Vat., Bar., Ottob. 2 τὰ κριτήρια] ἐγκλήματα *Anton., Max., Mel., Exc. Par., Vat., Apost.*: τὰ ῥήματα *Pal.-Vat.*: τὰ κυήματα *Bar., Ottob.*: τὰ νοήματα *Nil.*

***70B** Arethas, *Epistulae* 39 (BT 1.295.1–13 Westerink)

Στεφάνου [Ἐφέσου]

τὰς δὲ κύνας τυφλὰ τίκτειν ἐπειγομένας ἀφῆκας; τὸν δὲ Φαληρέα τοιαῦτα τίκτειν καὶ τὰ κριτήρια φάμενον εἴσας; αἱ δ' ὁξύτεραι τῶν βουλῶν οὐκ ἐπισφαλέστεραι; ὅσα σοι τοιουτότροπα.

1 Ἐφέσου *del. Kougeas*

71 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 254 (99.8–9 Sternbach)

122II W ὁ αὐτὸς εὐχομένους μὲν ἔφη δεῖν αἰτεῖσθαι τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν, βουλευομένους δὲ ζητεῖν δυνατά.

ad haec spectant quae dicit Aristid. Or. 6.22 p. 584.15–17 Lenz (30, vol. I p. 578 Dind.)

2 βουλευομένους *Aristid.*: βουλευσαμένους *cod.*

72 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 255 (99.14–16 Sternbach)

117 W ὁ αὐτὸς ἔφη δεῖν τοὺς καλῶς ἀγομένους τῶν νεανίσκων αἰδεῖσθαι ἐν μὲν ταῖς οἰκίαις τοὺς γονεῖς, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὁδοῖς τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἐρημίαις ἑαυτούς.

idem apophthegma Demetrio attribuitur in D.L. 5.82 (= 1.121–3) = Ars. 188.13–15 Walz, Max. 3 (PG 91.744B.18–21 Combefis), cod. Barberin. Gr. 3.8 f. 186^v, cod. Vallicellan. F 58 f. 187^r; cf. quae dicit Clem. Al. Paed. 3.5.33.3

1 ἀγομένους] ἀγωμένους *cod.* || τοὺς—νεανίσκων] τοὺς νέους *D.L.*: τοὺς ἀστεῖους τῶν νέων *Max., Ars., Vallicellan.*: τοῖς ἀστίοις τῶν νέων *Barb.* 2 ἐν μὲν] μὲν ἐν *cod.* 3 *post* ἀπαντῶντας *add.* ἐν δὲ τοῖς λουτροῖς τὰς γυναῖκας *Vallicellan.* || *post* ἑαυτούς *add.* πανταχοῦ δὲ τὸν θεόν, ὅς ἐστι πανταχοῦ *Vallicellan. (cf. Clem.)*

73 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 256 (100.1–2 Sternbach)

122III W ὁ αὐτὸς εἶπε τὸν μὴ δυνάμενον γενναίως ἐνεγκεῖν

***70B** Arethas, *Letters* 39 (*BT* 1.295.1–13 Westerink)

From Stephanus [from Ephesus]

Have you forgotten that bitches bear blind (offspring) if they are hurried? Have you let the Phalerean slip your mind who says that the senses are affected in the same way too? Aren't those decisions most likely to fail which have been made in haste? That is exactly what happens to you.¹

¹ This is a reply of Stephanus, keeper of the royal inkstand, to an impatient letter from Arethas about some papyrus which though promised to him by Stephanus had not yet arrived.

71 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 254 (99.8–9 Sternbach)

The same man (Demetrius of Phalerum) said that when praying we should ask for those goods which are greatest but in deliberating we should look for things which are possible.

72 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 255 (99.14–16 Sternbach)

The same man (Demetrius of Phalerum) said that it is fitting for those of the young who are well-bred, when at home to respect their parents, on journeys those they meet, and in solitary places themselves.

73 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 256 (100.1–2 Sternbach)

The same man (Demetrius of Phalerum) said that he who is

ἀτυχίαν μὴ δύνασθαι ἐπιδεξίως ἐνεγκεῖν εὐτυχίαν.

idem apophthegma Demetrio attribuitur in Anton. 1.70 (PG 136.984B.19–20 Migne), Max. 18.45 (cod. Vat. Gr. 739), Gnom. Basil. 276 (91.28–9 Kindstrand) (sed Democrito attribuitur in cod. Bar. Gr. 39), cod. Pal. 122 f. 212^r no. 206, Ars. 188.16–17 Walz; Demostheni attribuitur in Max. 18 (PG 91 833C.31–2 Combefis); sine nomine auctoris occurrit in Flor. Mon. 52 (BT 4.271.8–9 Meineke), Flor. Leid. 52 (10.10–11 Beynen), Flor. Pal.-Vat. 253, Gnom. Bar. 106 (= Gnom. Byz. 105 Wachsmuth), Flor. Ottobon. 107, Flor. Pal. 83 (22.6–7 Wachsmuth)

1–2 εἶπε—δύνασθαι] τὸν μὴ δυνάμενον (βουλόμενον *Max.*) γενναίως (*om. Anton.*) φέρειν ἀτυχίαν μηδ' εὐτυχίαν ἔφη δύνασθαι *Anton., Max., Basil., Pal. 122, Ars.*: τὸν μὴ δυνάμενον γενναίως ἐνεγκεῖν ἀτυχίαν ἴσθι (*om. Pal.-Vat., Bar., Ottob.*) μὴ δύνασθαι ἐπιδεξίως ἐνεγκεῖν εὐτυχίαν *Mon., Leid., Pal.-Vat., Bar., Ottob.*; *eadem in oratione recta* ὁ μὴ δυνάμενος—οὐ δύναται—εὐτυχίαν *Pal.*

74

Gnomologium Vaticanum 743, no. 257 (100.8–9 Sternbach)

122IV W

ὁ αὐτὸς ἔφη μὴ δεῖν ζητεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰ ἐκ μεγάλης πόλεως εἰσιν, ἀλλ' εἰ μεγάλης πόλεως ἄξιοι.

idem apophthegma Demetrio attribuitur in Flor. Mon. 187 (BT 4.281.26–8 Meineke) et Flor. Leid. 176 (28.3–5 Beynen), cf. 78; Aristoteli attribuitur in D.L. 5.19 (OCT 1.204.18–19 Long); Zenoni attribuitur in Max. 63 (PG 91.993.54–996.2 Combefis), Ars. 265.26–8 Walz

1–2 *in D.L. legitur* πρὸς τὸν καυχώμενον ὡς ἀπὸ μεγάλης πόλεως εἶη, “οὐ τοῦτο,” ἔφη, “δεῖ σκοπεῖν, ἀλλ' ὅστις μεγάλης πατρίδος ἄξιός ἐστιν.” 1 εἰ *Mon., Leid.*: οἵτινες *cod., Max. in cod. Vat. Gr. 385, Ars.*: εἷτινες *Max* 2 πόλεως] πόλεων *Max., Mon.* || πόλεως] πατρίδος *D.L.*: πόλεων *Max.*

75

Gnomologium Vaticanum 743, no. 258 (100.13–14 Sternbach)

122V W

ὁ αὐτὸς ἔλεγε τὸ μὲν τὰ κακὰ ἐνεγκεῖν ἀνδραπόδων εἶναι, τὸ δὲ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἀνδρῶν.

idem apophthegma Demostheni attribuitur in cod. Laur. Plut. 86.8 (= App. Gnom. 45 Sternbach); cf. quae dicit Pl. Grg. 483A8–B2

1 ἐνεγκεῖν] ὑπομεῖναι *App. Gnom.*

unable to take misfortune nobly is unable to take good fortune adroitly.

74 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 257 (100.8–9 Sternbach)

The same man (Demetrius of Phalerum) said one should not inquire whether people are from a great city but whether they are worthy of a great city.

75 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 258 (100.13–14 Sternbach)

The same man (Demetrius of Phalerum) said that it is the part of slaves to endure things bad, of men things good.

76 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no 259 (100.18–19 Sternbach)

122VI W ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τί τῶν ζώων κάλλιστόν ἐστιν εἶπεν· “ἄνθρωπος παιδείᾳ κεκοσμημένος.”

idem apophthegma Aristoteli attribuitur in Exc. Flor. 2.13 no. 47 (BT 4.195.19–21 Meineke); Isocrati attribuitur in Mel. Aug. 38.18; Socrati attribuitur in Anton. 1.50 (PG 136.936A.10–11 Migne), Max. 17 (PG 91.824.36–7 Combefis) (= Socrates I C 366 SSR I 133 Giannantoni), cod. Par. Gr. 1168 (= Exc. Par. 255 Sternbach), cod. Pal. Gr. 243 f. 248^v, Ars. 436.17–18 Walz; sententia οὐδὲν ἐν ζώοις κάλλιστόν ἐστιν ὡς ἄνθρωπος παιδείᾳ κεκοσμημένος sine mentione auctoris occurrit in Flor. Pal.-Vat. 166, cod. Paris. 1168 f. 140^r–46^v (= Gnom. Par. 24 = Gnom. Byz. 53 Wachsmuth), Gnom. Bar. 38 (= Gnom. Byz. 53 Wachsmuth), Flor. Ottobon. 39; sub titulo ἐκ τῶν Δημοκράτους (vel Δημοκρίτου) Ἰσοκράτους καὶ Ἐπικτήτου in Max. 17 (PG 91.825.44–5 Combefis); sub Democriti nomine in cod. Vat. Gr. 633 f. 115^v

2 τὴν ψυχὴν ante παιδείᾳ addit. Exc. Flor. II κεκοσμημένος] κοσμούμενος Max.

77 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 260 (101.8 Sternbach)

122VII W ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τίς ἄριστος σύμβουλος ἔφη· “ὁ καιρός.”

idem apophthegma Demetrio attribuitur in cod. Pal. Gr. 297 f. 118^r no. 69; Democrati Parrhesiastae attribuitur in cod. Vat. Gr. 1144 f. 217^r (App. Vat. I 47 Sternbach), ubi sequitur no. 49 = 38; Bianti attribuitur in Max. 2 (PG 91.733.37–8 Combefis) (= Bias F 16 FPhG I 229 Mullach), Gnom. Basil. 74 Kindstrand, Gnom. cod. Pal. 122 f. 159^r no. 68, Ars. 147.16–17 Walz; Euclidi attribuitur in Flor. Pal.-Vat. 69; cod. Ottobon. Gr. 192 f. 277^r (= Euclides F 13 Döring = II A 19 SSR I 383 Giannantoni); Demostheni attribuitur in cod. Vat. Gr. 742 f. 66^r, Laurent. Plut. 86.8 f. 315^r (= App. Gnom. 46 Sternbach)

1 ὁ αὐτὸς] Βίας Basil.

***78** *Florilegium Monacense* no. 186 (BT 4.281.24–5 Meineke)

Δημήτριος ἐρωτηθεὶς τί δυσκολώτατον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, “σιωπὴ” ἔφη.

sequitur no. 187 = 74; idem apophthegma Demetrio attribuitur in Flor. Leid. 175 (28.1–2 Beynen) ubi sequitur no. 176 = 74; Aristoteli attribuitur in Stob. Anth. 3.41.8 (BT 3.759.1–2 Hense) (= Aristoteles F →

76 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 259 (100.18–19 Sternbach)

The same man (Demetrius of Phalerum) when asked which is the finest of living beings replied: a human being adorned with breeding.

77 *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 260 (101.8 Sternbach)

The same man (Demetrius of Phalerum) when asked who is the best counselor said: the right moment.

***78** *Florilegium Monacense* no. 186 (BT 4.281.24–5 Meineke)

Demetrius, when asked what is the most unpleasant thing among humans, said “silence.”

67f no. 8 p. 402 Düring), *Gnom. Vat.* 743, no. 58 (28.1–2 Sternbach), *cod. Par.* 1168 f. 89^r (cf. *RhM* 35 (1880) 419), *cod. Vat. Gr.* 1144 f. 228^r (= *App. Vat.* II 6 Sternbach), *Max.* 20 (PG 91.848.3–4 Combefis), *Gnom. Basil.* 17 Kindstrand, *cod. Pal.* 122 f. 134^r no. 15, *Ars.* 122.11–12 Walz; *Joanni Chrysostomo attribuitur in cod. Ottobon. Gr.* 192 f. 190^r

1 δυσκολώτατον] δύσκολον *App. Vat.* II ἐν ἀνθρώποις *Mon. et Leid.*: ἐν (τῷ) βίῳ *ceteri testes* 2 σιωπῇ] σιωπὴν *Leid.*: τὸ σιωπᾶν *Gnom. Vat., App. Vat.*: τὸ σιωπᾶν ἃ μὴ δεῖ λαλεῖν *Stob., Max., Gnom. Basil., Ars.*

***79** *Florilegium Monacense* no. 188 (BT 4.282.1–2 Meineke)

ὁ αὐτὸς τὴν φιλαργυρίαν μητρόπολιν ἔλεγε πάσης κακίας.

cf. ad 78; idem apophthegma Demetrio attribuitur in Flor. Leid. 177 (28.6–7 Beynen); Democrito attribuitur in Gnom. Vat. 265 (102.17 Sternbach) = cod. Vat. Gr. 742 f. 66^r (= App. Gnom. 47 Sternbach) et cod. Laur. Plut. 86.8 f. 315^r; Bianti attribuitur in Proleg. in Aphthonii Prog. RhG 2.17.25–18.1 Walz; Bioni attribuitur in Theon Prog. 5 (CB 22.20–1 [= Bion F 35B Kindstrand] et 29.7–9 [= F 35C Kindstrand] Patillon), Stob. Anth. 3.10.37 (BT 3.417.5–6 Hense) (= F 35A Kindstrand); Diogeni attribuitur in D.L. 6.50 (OCT 2.268.21–2 Long); Ars. 208.4–5 Walz

1 πάσης κακίας] πάντων τῶν κακῶν *D.L., Ars.*: τῆς κακίας *Theon p. 105* || *post vel ante* πάσης κακίας *add. εἶναι Stob., Theon, App. Gnom., Aphthon.*

***79** *Florilegium Monacense* no. 188 (*BT* 4.282.1–2 Meineke)

The same man (Demetrius) said that love of money is the mother-city of all evil.

III. SCRIPTA

de Demetrii Phalerii scriptis vide Diogenem Laertium, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.80–1 = 1.58–109; vide etiam **80**; **81**; **88**; **118**; **149**; **150**

80 *Tabula Rhodiensis* col. I 1–7 (215.1–7 RFIC 63 (N.S. 13) 1935 Segre)

76 W [Δημητρίου]
110 W 1 Βοιωτιακός
101 W 2 Ἀρίσταιχμος
2 Κλέ ἔ[ν]
4 Φαιδώνδας ἥ περὶ ο[
5 Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι
6 νομοθεσίας πέ[ντε
7 Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι πολι[τειῶν

fin. saec. II aCn ed. pr. A. Maiuri, NSERC 1925 no. 11 p. 14–15; iterum edidit M. Segre, RFIC 63 (N.S. 13) (1935) 214–22; cf. G. De Sanctis, RFIC 54 (N.S. 4) (1926) 63–73; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, Gnomon 2 (1926) 195–6; 365; C. Wendel, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 46 (1929) 1–6; L. Robert, BCH 1935, 424–5 (= OMS I 1969, 181–2), REG 49 (1936) 377 1–7 228 T II FGrH 1 v. 118 2 v. 150 3 cf. 1.78 et v. 88 4 cf. 1.76 et v. 88 5–7 cf. 1.65–6 et v. 88

in titulo [Δημητρίου] suppl. Wilamowitz 2 [έν] Jacoby 3 ἔ[ν] De Sanctis, Jacoby 4 ὁ[λιγαρχίας] dubitanter De Sanctis: ὁ[μονοίας] Hiller 7 πολι[τειῶν] Hiller, Wendel, Jacoby: πολι[τῶν δύο] De Sanctis: πολι[τευμάτων] Maiuri

Ethica

cf. dicta Demetrii in 1.113–15; 117–25; **70A–B**; **71–3**; **75–6**; **78–9**; **82A.6–21**; **82B.4**; **83.7–8**; **116A.17–20**; 26–7; **116B.8–10**; **129.7–11**; **143.19–22**

Inscriptiones librorum

81 *Tabula inscriptionum ad opera ethica spectantium*

1 Περὶ τύχης α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.91; Polybius, *Historiae* 29.21 = **82A.2–3** = Excerpta

III. WRITINGS

For the writings of Demetrius of Phalerum see Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.80–1 = 1.58–109; see also **80**; **81**; **88**; **118**; **149**; **150**

- 80** *Rhodian Book Catalogue* col. I 1–7 (215.1–7 *RFIC* 63 (N.S. 13) 1935 Segre)

[Of Demetrius:]

Boeotian (Speech)

Aristaechmus

Cleon, one book

Phaedondas or *On*

On Legislation at Athens, five books

On Constitutions at Athens

Ethics

cp. the sayings of Demetrius in 1.113–15; 117–25; **70A–B**; **71–3**; **75–6**; **78–9**; **82A.6–21**; **82B.4**; **83.7–8**; **116A.17–20**; 26–7; **116B.8–10**; **129.7–11**; **143.19–22**

Titles of Books

- 81** List of Titles Referring to Ethical Works

- 1 *On Fortune*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.91; Polybius, *Histories* 29.21 = **82A.2–3** = Excerpta Constantini

Constantini Porphyrogeniti, *De sententiis* 125 (4.194.28 Boissevain) **app. 82A** (ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς τύχης ὑπομνήματι); Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* 31.10.1 = **82B.2** = Excerpta Constantini Porphyrogeniti, *De sententiis* 360 (4.373.2 Boissevain) **app. 82B** (ἐν τῷ περὶ τύχης ὑπομνήματι)

- 2 Περὶ γήρως α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.106; 9.20 = **84.1** (ἐν τῷ Περὶ γήρως); 2.13 = **85.7–8** (ἐν τῷ Περὶ γήρως)
- 3 Περὶ ὀνείρων α' β' γ' δ' ε'] Artemidorus, *Onirocriticon* 2.44 = **86** (sine inscriptione libri)
- 4 Τῶν Ἐπτὰ Σοφῶν Ἀποφθέγματα] Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 3.1.172 = **87.1**
- 5 Χρειῶν α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.109
- 6 Δίκαια α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.107
- 7 Ἐρωτικὸς α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.75
- 8 Περὶ ἐπιτηδευμάτων α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.97
- 9 Περὶ μεγαλοψυχίας α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.92
- 10 Περὶ χάριτος α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.90
- 11 Προτρεπτικὸς α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.84

cf. Ὑπὲρ ἐλέου] papyrus inedita: *Papiri della Società Italiana* Inv. CNR 70 (Δημητρίου ἢ ὑπὲρ ἐλέου), de quo vide Dorandi in hoc volumine

De Fortuna [Περὶ τύχης **82A–B**]

cf. dictum Demetrii in Diogene Laertio servatum, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.82 = 1.115–16

82A Polybius, *Historiae* 29.21 (BT 4.259.20–261.10 Büttner-Wobst)

- 81 W 1 ὥστε πολλάκις καὶ λίαν μνημονεύειν τῆς Δημητρίου
2 τοῦ Φαληρέως φωνῆς. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς τύχης

- Porphyrogeneriti, *On Wise Sayings* 125 (4.194.28 Boissevain) **app. 82A** (“in his monograph on Fortune”); Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History* 31.10.1 = **82B.2** = Excerpta Constantini Porphyrogeniti, *On Wise Sayings* 360 (4.373.2 Boissevain) **app. 82B** (“in his monograph *On Fortune*”)
- 2 *On Old Age*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.106**; 9.20 = **84.1** (“in his *On Old Age*”); 2.13 = **85.7–8** (“in his *On Old Age*”)
 - 3 *On Dreams*, 5 books] Artemidorus, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 2.44 = **86**, where the words do not occur as a title
 - 4 *Sayings of the Seven Wise Men*] Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.1.172 = **87.1**
 - 5 *Practical Maxims*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.109**
 - 6 *Matters of Justice*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.107**
 - 7 *(Dialogue) on Love*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.75**
 - 8 *On Pursuits*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.97**
 - 9 *On Greatness of Soul*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.92**
 - 10 *On Kindness (or Grace)*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.90**
 - 11 *Exhortation*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.84**
- cp. *On Compassion*] unedited papyrus: *Papiri della Società Italiana* Inv. CNR 70 (“By Demetrius | *On Compassion*”), on which see Dorandi in this volume

On Fortune [*On Fortune* **82A–B**]

cp. the saying of Demetrius in Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.82 = **1.115–16**

82A Polybius, *Histories* 29.21 (BT 4.259.20–261.10 Büttner-Wobst)

- 1 So that I very often indeed think of the utterance of Demetrius
- 2 of Phalerum. For he in his monograph *On Fortune*, when he

- ὑπομνήματι βουλόμενος ἐναργῶς ὑποδεικνύναι τοῖς
 ἀνθρώποις τὸ ταύτης εὐμετάβολον, ἐπιστὰς ἐπὶ τοὺς
 κατ' Ἀλέξανδρον καιροὺς, ὅτε κατέλυσε τὴν Περσῶν 5
 3 ἀρχήν, λέγει ταῦτα· “εἰ γὰρ λάβοι τις μὴ χρόνον ἄπειρον
 μηδὲ γενεὰς πολλάς, ἀλλὰ πεντήκοντα μόνον ἔτη ταυτὶ
 τὰ πρὸ ἡμῶν, γνοίητ' ἂν ὡς τὸ τῆς τύχης χαλεπὸν ἐν-
 4 ταῦθα. πεντηκοστὸν γὰρ ἔτος οἶεσθ' ἂν ἢ Πέρσας ἢ
 βασιλέας τῶν Περσῶν ἢ Μακεδόνας ἢ βασιλέας τῶν 10
 Μακεδόνων, εἴ τις θεῶν αὐτοῖς προύλεγε τὸ μέλλον,
 πιστεῦσαί ποτ' ἂν ὡς εἰς τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν Περσῶν οὐδ'
 ὄνομα λειφθήσεται τὸ παράπαν, οἱ πάσης τῆς οἰκου-
 μένης ἐδέσποζον, Μακεδόνες δὲ πάσης κρατοῦσιν, ὧν
 5 οὐδ' ὄνομα πρότερον ἦν. ἀλλὰ πως ἢ πρὸς τὸν βίον ἡμῶν 15
 ἀσύνθετος τύχη καὶ πάντα παρὰ λογισμὸν τὸν ἡμέτερον
 καινοποιοῦσα καὶ τὴν αὐτῆς δύναμιν ἐν τοῖς παρα-
 δόξοις ἐνδεικνυμένη καὶ νῦν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, δείκνυσι
 6 πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, Μακεδόνας εἰς τὴν Περσῶν εὐδαι-
 μονίαν εἰσοικίσασα, διότι καὶ τούτοις ταῦτα τὰγαθὰ 20
 7 κέχρηκεν, ἕως ἄλλο τι βουλευέσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν.” ὁ νῦν
 γέγονε κατὰ Περσέα. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν Δημήτριος ὥσανεὶ
 θείῳ τινὶ στόματι περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀποπεφοίβακεν.
 8 ἐγὼ δὲ κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν ἐπιστὰς τοῖς καιροῖς καθ' οὓς
 συνέβη καταλυθῆναι τὴν Μακεδόνων βασιλείαν, οὐκ 25
 ἔκρινον ἀνεπιστάτως παραδραμεῖν, ἅτε γεγρονῶς
 αὐτόπτης τῆς πράξεως, ἀλλ' αὐτός τε τὸν πρέποντα
 9 λόγον ἐπιφθέγξασθαι καὶ Δημητρίου μνησθῆναι· δοκεῖ
 γὰρ μοι θειοτέραν ἢ κατ' ἄνθρωπον τὴν ἀπόφασιν
 ποιήσασθαι· σχεδὸν γὰρ ἑκατὸν καὶ πεντήκοντα πρό- 30
 τερον ἔτεσι τάληθες ἀπεφήνατο περὶ τῶν ἔπειτα συμ-
 βησομένων.

1–32 *Exc. Const. De sent.* 125 (4.194.27–195.24 *Boissevain*) 1–21
228 F 39 *FGrH*

6 λάβοι τις] λάβοις πρὸ τῆς ἐννοίας *D.S.*: λάβοιτ' ἐν νῶ *Büttner-Wobst* 7–8 ταυτὶ τὰ *Geel e D.S.*: ταύτη *cod.* 8 γνοίητ' ἂν] γνοίης ἂν *D.S.* 9 πεντήκοστον γὰρ ἔτος] πεντηκοστῷ γὰρ ἔτει πρότερον *D.S.* || οἶεσθ' ἂν μὴ] οἶσθα μὴ *D.S.* 10 βασιλέας—βασιλέας] βασιλέα—βασιλέα *D.S.* 12 *ante* οὐδ' *add.* μὲν *D.S.* 13 *post* πάσης *add.* σχεδὸν *D.S.* 14 *ante* πάσης *add.* καὶ *D.S.* || κρατοῦσιν] κρατήσουσιν *D.S.* 15 *post* ἦν *add.* γνώριμον *D.S.* || ἀλλὰ πως] →

wants to show people clearly its changeable nature, points to the decisive moments in Alexander's time when he brought down the Persian empire, and states "If one focuses not on an infinite time and on many generations but on just these fifty years behind us, you can see here how hard to overcome is the influence of fortune. Do you think that fifty years ago,¹ if one of the gods had told either the Persians or their Kings or the Macedonians or their Kings, what the future would bring, (they) would ever have believed that by the present time nothing would remain even of the name of the Persians, who were the rulers of all the inhabited world, and that the Macedonians now rule over all of it, who before were nameless? No, in a way fortune—which deals with our lives as a free agent, effecting all things in complete disregard of our calculations and demonstrating its power in things we did not expect—this time again, it seems to me, shows all people, by establishing the Macedonians in the prosperity that used to be the Persians', that it has lent these blessings to them as well until it arrives at a different decision concerning them." And that is what has happened now in the case of Perseus.² This prophetic utterance of Demetrius was spoken as if with a divinely inspired mouth about the future. As for me, when in writing I reached the times that the reign of the Macedonians happened to be brought to an end, I did not think it right to pass it over without giving attention to it, because I have been an eyewitness to the train of events; on the contrary, I thought it right both to voice the appropriate comment myself and to mention Demetrius. For I think his statement is divine rather than what can be expected of a mere human. For almost a hundred and fifty years before the event he stated the truth about what was going to happen afterwards.

¹ I.e., around 336/5 B.C. according to Jacoby *FGrH* II b 645 on 228 T 7.

² Perseus, king of Macedonia 179–168 B.C., was defeated at Pydna by the Romans in 168 (Liv. 45.9).

ἀλλ' ὅμως *D.S.* 15–16 ἡ—τύχη] ἡ πρὸς τὸν βίον ἡμῶν ἀλογία (*Mai: ἀναλογία cod.*) τῆς τύχης *D.S.* 16 παρὰ] παρὰ τὸν *D.S.* 17–18 παραδόξοις] ἐνδόξοις *D.S.* 18–19 ὡς ἐμοὶ—ἀνθρώποις] ὡς ὁμοίως ἐνδείκνυται *D.S.* 19–20 εὐδαιμονίαν] ἡγεμονίαν *D.S.* 20 εἰσοικίσασα] ἐνοικίσασα *D.S.* || τούτοις] τούτους *D.S.* || ταῦτα] ἡ τύχη *D.S.* 21 ἕως] ἕως ἂν *D.S.*

82B Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* 31.10 (BT 6.12.13–13.8 Fischer)

81 W ὅτι ἀκμαζούσης τῆς τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλείας
 Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῷ περὶ τύχης ὑπομνήματι,
 καθάπερ χρησμοδῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῇ συμβησομένων,
 εὐστόχως τούτους τοὺς λόγους ἀποπεφοίβακεν. ... ὃ
 συνέβη κατὰ τοὺς νῦν χρόνους συντελεσθῆναι. διόπερ 5
 καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκρίναμεν τῇ περιστάσει ταύτῃ τὸν ἀρμόζοντα
 λόγον ἐπιφθέγξασθαι καὶ τῆς ἀποφάσεως τῆς Δημητρίου
 μνησθῆναι, μείζονος οὔσης ἢ κατ' ἄνθρωπον· προεῖπε
 γὰρ ἑκατὸν καὶ πεντήκοντα ἔτεσι περὶ τῶν ὕστερον
 συμβησομένων. 10

1–10 *Exc. Const. De sent.* 360 (4.373.1–22 Boissevain); 228 F 39 FGrH
 4 ...] *sequuntur verba Demetrii* εἰ γὰρ λάβοις—περὶ αὐτῶν = **82A**.6–
 21

9 ἔτεσι] ‘an (πρότερον) ἔτεσι?’ Boissevain: ἔτη Fischer

83 [Plutarchus], *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 6 104A–B (BT 1.213.1–8 Gärtner)

79 W ὅθεν ὀρθῶς ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος εἰπόντος Εὐρι-
 πίδου
 “ὁ δ’ ὄλβος οὐ βέβαιος ἀλλ’ ἐφήμερος”
 καὶ ὅτι
 “μικρὰ τὰ σφάλλοντα, καὶ μί’ ἡμέρα 5
 τὰ μὲν καθεῖλεν ὑπόθεν τὰ δ’ ἦρ’ ἄνω”
 B τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καλῶς ἔφη λέγειν αὐτόν, βέλτιον δ’ ἂν
 ἔχειν, εἰ μὴ μίαν ἡμέραν ἀλλὰ στιγμὴν εἶπε χρόνου.

1–8 228 F 24 FGrH; *Eur. F* 547e Mette, *Lustrum* 12 (1967) 136;
Crantor F 4 Mette, *Lustrum* 26 (1984) 18 3 *Eur. Phoen.* 558; *versus*
a Crantore laudatur ap. Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 11.55 5–6 *Stob.* 4.41.1
 = *Eur. F* 420.2–3 N.² = *F* 547e Mette

5 μικρὰ τὰ *Stob.*: μικρότατα *codd.* || σφάλλοντα *Stob.*: σφάλλονται
codd. 7–8 ἂν ἔχειν *Paton et Wyttenbach*: εἶχεν ὃν (ἂν B) *codd.* 8
 μίαν ... χρόνου] *cf. Sen. Ep.* 91.6 *hora momentumque temporis* || εἶπε]
 εἶχε Φ

82B Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History* 31.10 (BT 6.12.13–13.8 Fischer)

That, at a time when the reign of the Macedonians was at its height, Demetrius of Phalerum in his monograph *On Fortune*, as if prophesying about what would happen to it, hit the truth by uttering the following prophetic words: ...¹ And that has actually been fulfilled in the present times. For that very reason we have thought it fitting to voice the appropriate comment upon this reversal (of fortune) and to mention the statement of Demetrius, since it was greater than is to be expected of a human being. For he made a prediction one hundred and fifty years ahead about what was going to happen later on.

¹ These words are quoted in **82A.6–21**.

83 [Plutarch], *Condolence Addressed to Apollonius* 6 104A–B (BT 1.213.1–8 Gärtner)

This is why Demetrius of Phalerum was correct in his response to Euripides when he said

“Bliss does not last beyond one day,”¹

and that

“little things are enough to cause one’s fall, and a single day has brought one down from high above and raised the other.”²

B Demetrius said that Euripides was right about the rest but would have done better to say not “one day” but “one point in time.”

¹ Said by Iocasta to Eteocles (Eur. *Phoen.* 558).

² A fragment from Euripides’ *Ino* according to Stobaeus. The preceding verse of the fragment makes clear that this statement is applied to tyrants in particular.

De Senectute [Περὶ γήρως 84–5]

84 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.20 (OCT 2.446.24–447.3 Long)

83 W φησὶ δὲ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῷ Περὶ γήρως καὶ Παναίτιος ὁ Στωικὸς ἐν τῷ Περὶ εὐθυμίας ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶ θάψαι τοὺς υἱεῖς αὐτόν, καθάπερ καὶ Ἀναξαγόραν.

1–4 228 F 37 FGrH; Panaetius F 45 van Straaten = T 86 Alesse; Xenophanes 21 A 1 DK (I 114.7–10) 3–4 Ἀναξαγόραν] cf. 85, 94

1–2 καὶ —εὐθυμίας om. F

85 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 2.13 (OCT 1.62.8–15 Long)

82 W ὅτε καὶ ἀμφοτέρων αὐτῷ προσαγγελέντων, τῆς τε καταδίκης καὶ τῆς τῶν παίδων τελευτῆς, εἰπεῖν περὶ μὲν τῆς καταδίκης, ὅτι ἄρα “κᾶκείνων κᾶμοῦ πάλαι ἡ φύσις κατεψηφίσατο,” περὶ δὲ τῶν παίδων, ὅτι “ἥδειν αὐτοὺς θνητοὺς γεννήσας.” οἱ δ’ εἰς Σόλωνα τοῦτ’ ἀναφέρουσιν, 5 ἄλλοι εἰς Ξενοφῶντα. τοῦτον δὲ καὶ θάψαι ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶν αὐτοὺς Δημήτριός φησιν ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῷ Περὶ γήρως.

1–8 228 F 38 FGrH; Anaxagoras 59 A 1 DK (II 7.5–10); cf. 84, 94

1 προσαγγελέντων FΦ

De insomniis [Περὶ Ὀνείρων 86]

86 Artemidorus, *Onirocriticon* 2.44 (BT 179.11–18 Pack)

99 W ὄνειρους δὲ ἀποβεβηκότας καὶ τὰς ἀποβάσεις αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐνεδέχετο γράφειν ἐν τέχνῃ ὄνειροκριτικῇ καὶ ὑποθήκαις θεωρημάτων. οὐδέ μοι πιθανὰ ἐδόκει ταῦτα, καίτοι Γεμίνου τοῦ Τυρίου καὶ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαλη- 5 ρέως καὶ Ἀρτέμωνος τοῦ Μιλησίου τοῦ μὲν ἐν τρισὶ βιβλίοις τοῦ δὲ ἐν πέντε τοῦ δὲ ἐν εἰκοσιδύο πολλοὺς ὄνειρους ἀναγραψαμένων καὶ μάλιστα συνταγὰς καὶ

On Old Age [*On Old Age* 84–5]

- 84** Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 9.20 (*OCT* 2.446.24–447.3 Long)

Demetrius of Phalerum in his *On Old Age* and Panaetius the Stoic in his *On Being of Good Cheer* say that he (Xenophanes) buried his sons with his own hands, just like Anaxagoras.

- 85** Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 2.13 (*OCT* 1.62.8–15 Long)

And when he (Anaxagoras) was informed of these two things, both the verdict against him and the death of his children, his comment on the verdict was “Nature sentenced both them and me to death long ago,” and about his children “I knew they were mortal when I begot them.” There are also people who attribute this latter saying to Solon, and others to Xenophon. That he (Anaxagoras) actually buried them with his own hands is asserted by Demetrius of Phalerum in his *On Old Age*.

On Dreams [*On Dreams* 86]

- 86** Artemidorus, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 2.44 (*BT* 179.11–18 Pack)

But it was not possible to describe dreams that had come true and their outcome in a handbook on interpreting dreams and in instructions for observations. Nor do these strike me as convincing, even though Geminus of Tyrus, Demetrius of Phalerum and Artemon of Miletus in works of three, five and twenty-two books respectively have produced records of numerous dreams, particu-

θεραπείας τὰς ἀπὸ Σαράπιδος δοθείσας.

8 θεραπείας—δοθείσας] *D.L.* 5.76 (= 1.19–20); *de Serapide* cf. *Str.* 17.1.17

1–8 *deest in L* 4 Τυρίου *Rigault*: πυρίου *V* 8 ἀπὸ *V*: ὑπὸ *Pack*

Demetrii Ecloga Sententiarum

de ecloga sententiarum a Demetrio collecta vide W. Brunco, 'De dictis VII sapientum a Demetrio Phalereo collectis,' *Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis* 3 (1884) 299–397; O. Hense ad Stobaei *Anthologium* 3.1.172, III.112–25; W. Bühler, 'Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Sprüche der sieben Weisen,' *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I. Philol.-Hist. Klasse, 1989.1, 1–36; M. Tziatzi-Papagianni, *Die Sprüche der sieben Weisen. Zwei byzantinische Sammlungen. Einleitung, Text, Testimonien und Kommentar*. Stuttgart & Leipzig 1994 (= *Beiträge zur Altertums-kunde*, 51), 2–5.

testimonia collecta sunt a Brunco 1884, 325–83 et Tziatzi-Papagianni 1994 (*Rec. Par.*₁ 131–254; *Rec. Par.*₂ 257–336; *Rec. Mon.* 365–434). praeterea cf. 'Die sieben Weisen' 10 no. 3 DK I 62–6.

87 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 3.1.172 (3.111.8–125.2 Hense)

114 W

Δημητρίου Φαληρέως τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα.

α' Κλεόβουλος Εὐαγόρου Λίνδιος ἔφη·

1. μέτρον ἄριστον. 2. πατέρα δεῖ αἰδεῖσθαι. 3. εὖ τὸ σῶμα ἔχειν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν. 4. φιλήκοον εἶναι καὶ μὴ πολύλαλον. 5. πολυμαθῇ † ἢ ἀμαθῇ. 6. γλῶσσαν εὖφημον κεκτῆσθαι. 7. ἀρετῆς οἰκεῖον (εἶναι), κακίας ἀλλότριον. 8. ἀδικίαν μισεῖν. 9. εὐσέβειαν φυλάσσειν. 10. πολίταις τὰ βέλτιστα συμβουλεύειν. 11. ἡδονῆς κρατεῖν. 12. βία μηδὲν πράττειν. 13. τέκνα παιδεύειν. 14. τύχῃ εὖχεσθαι. 15. ἔχθρας διαλύειν. 16. τὸν τοῦ δήμου ἐχθρὸν πολέμιον νομίζειν. 17. γυναικὶ μὴ μάχεσθαι μηδὲ ἄγαν † φρονεῖν ἀλλοτρίων παρόντων· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄνοιαν, τὸ δὲ μανίαν δύναται παρέχειν. 18. οἰκέτας μεθύοντας μὴ κολάζειν· εἰ δὲ μή, δόξεις παροινεῖν. 19. γαμεῖν ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων· ἐὰν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν κρειττόνων, 15 δεσπότης, οὐ συγγενεῖς κτήσῃ. 20. μὴ ἐπιγέλα τῷ

larly of orders and cures provided by Sarapis.

Selection of Sayings (made) by Demetrius

On the selection of sayings collected by Demetrius of Phalerum see W. Brunco, 'De dictis VII sapientum a Demetrio Phalereo collectis,' *Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis* 3 (1884) 299–397; O. Hense on Stobaeus' *Anthology* 3.1.172, III.112–25; W. Bühler, 'Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Sprüche der sieben Weisen,' *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I. Philol.-Hist. Klasse, 1989.1, 1–36; M. Tziatzi-Papagianni, *Die Sprüche der sieben Weisen. Zwei byzantinische Sammlungen. Einleitung, Text, Testimonien und Kommentar*. Stuttgart & Leipzig 1994 (= *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde*, 51), 2–5.

The testimonia have been collected by Brunco 1884, 325–83 and by Tziatzi-Papagianni 1994 (*Rec. Par.*₁ 131–254; *Rec. Par.*₂ 257–336; *Rec. Mon.* 365–434).

Cp. also 'Die sieben Weisen' 10 no. 3 DK I 62–6.

87 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.1.172 (3.111.8–125.2 Hense)

Sayings of the Seven Wise Men by Demetrius of Phalerum

1: Cleobulus, son of Euagoras, of Lindus said:

1. Due measure (is) best. 2. One should respect one's father. 3. Be well in body and in soul. 4. Enjoy listening and do not talk too much. 5. Very learned †than/or† unlearned. 6. Keep your tongue well-spoken. 7. Be at home with virtue, a stranger to badness. 8. Hate injustice. 9. Watch over piety. 10. To your fellow-citizens give the best advice. 11. Conquer pleasure. 12. Do not do anything by force. 13. Educate your children. 14. Pray to Fortune. 15. Resolve enmities. 16. Consider the person hostile to the people your enemy. 17. Do not fight with a woman nor †have thoughts too much† in the presence of strangers: the one can suggest foolishness, the other madness. 18. Do not punish slaves when they are drunk; if you do, you will seem intoxicated yourself. 19. Marry among your equals; for if you (marry) among your betters, you will get overlords, not in-laws. 20. Do not laugh when one

σκώπτοντι· ἀπεχθής γὰρ ἔσῃ τοῖς σκωπτομένοις. 21. εὐποροῦντα μὴ ὑπερήφανον εἶναι, ἀποροῦντα μὴ ταπεινοῦσθαι.

nos. 2, 3, 4–7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15–21 = nos. 2, 3–4, 5–8, 10, 9, 11–12, 13, 14–20 Par.₁ nos. 1, 12–14 desunt in Par._p, cf. Mon. 1, 15–16, 2 no. 1 Par.₁ habet θεὸν σέβεσθαι (cf. Solonis no. 15) || 1–19 = Ars. 187.21–188.10 Walz, omisso α' Κλεόβουλος—ἔφη no. 1 D.L. 1.93 nos. 3–8; 10–13; 15 D.L. 1.92 nos. 17–21 D.L. 1.92–3, ubi sequitur τὰς μεταβολὰς τῆς τύχης γενναίως ἐπίστασο φέρειν nos. 2, 9, 14 et 16 desunt in D.L.

no. 2 πατέρα δεῖ] γονέας Par.₁ no. 3 κόσμιον εἶναι τὸ σῶμα. ἀσκεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν Par.₁ || ἔχειν—ψυχὴν] ἀσκεῖν D.L. no. 4 φιλήκοον εἶναι, φιλομαθῇ Par.₁ || καὶ μὴ πολύλαλον] μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόλαλον D.L. no. 5 φιλομαθῇ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀμαθῇ D.L.: ὀψιμαθῇ μᾶλλον εἶναι ἢ ἀμαθῇ Par.₁ →

β' Σόλων Ἐξηκεστίδου Ἀθηναῖος ἔφη·

1. μηδὲν ἄγαν. 2. κριτῆς μὴ κάθησο· εἰ δὲ μή, τῷ ληφθέντι ἐχθρὸς ἔσῃ. 3. ἡδονὴν φεῦγε, ἥτις λύπην τίκτει. 4. φύλασσε τρόπου καλοκαγαθίαν ὅρκου πιστοτέραν. 5. σφραγίζου τοὺς μὲν λόγους σιγῇ, τὴν δὲ σιγὴν καιρῷ. 6. μὴ ψεύδου, ἀλλ' ἀλήθευε. 7. τὰ σπουδαῖα μελέτα. 8. τῶν 25 γονέων μὴ λέγε δικαιότερα. 9. φίλους μὴ ταχὺ κτῶ, οὓς δ' ἂν κτήσῃ, μὴ ταχὺ ἀποδοκίμαζε. 10. ἄρχεσθαι μαθὼν, ἄρχειν ἐπιστήσῃ. 11. εὐθύνας ἐτέρους ἀξιῶν διδόναι, καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπέχε. 12. συμβούλευε μὴ τὰ ἡδιστα, ἀλλὰ τὰ βέλτιστα. 13. τοῖς πολίταις μὴ θρασύνου. 14. μὴ κακοῖς 30 ὁμίλει. 15. χρῶ τοῖς θεοῖς. 16. φίλους εὐσέβει. 17. ὃ ἂν <μὴ> ἴδῃς μὴ λέγε. 18. εἰδὼς σίγα. 19. τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πρῶτος ἴσθι. 20. τὰ ἀφανῆ τοῖς φανεροῖς τεκμαίρου.

nos. 2–3, 4, 5, 6, 8–9, 10–11, 12–13, 14–15, 17–18 = nos. 1–2, 3–4, 4(a), 5, 6–7, 8, 9–10, 12–13, 14 Par.₁ nos. 1, 7, 19 desunt in Par._p, cf. Mon. 1, 7, 17 nos. 16 et 20 desunt in Par.₁ || no. 1 D.L. 1.63 no. 2 cf. D.L. 1.87 (vita Biantis) no. 4 D.L. 1.60 no. 5 D.L. 1.58 nos. 6–7; 9–10; 12; 14–15 D.L. 1.60 no. 20 post τεκμαίρου addit ἰσχύι χρῶ πρὸς πολεμίους, πρὸς δὲ οἰκείους αἰσχύνη Br (= no. 11 Par.₁) nos. 3, 8, 11, 13, 16–20 desunt in D.L. || desunt in Stob. D.L. 1.60 νοῦν ἡγεμόνα ποιοῦ (cf. Solonis Mon. 13) et γονέας αἰδοῦ (cf. Cleobuli no. 2 Par.₁)

no. 2 φίλων κριτῆς μὴ γίνου Par.₁ no. 4 καλοκαγαθίαν ὅρκου πιστοτέραν ἔχε D.L.: φυλάσσου τὸν τρόπον. καλοκαγαθίας ὀρέγου →

person is making fun of (another); for you will be hateful to the persons who are being made fun of. 21. When affluent, do not be highhanded, when without means, do not be humble.

no. 6 κεκτῆσθαι] ἴσχειν *D.L.* *no. 7* εἶναι *add. e D.L. Hense* *no. 8* μισεῖν] φεύγειν *D.L.* *no. 9* εὐσέβειαν] εὐκλειαν *Par.*₁ *no. 10* ποιεῖν τὰ βέλτιστα. συμβουλεύειν καλῶς *Par.*₁ || πολίταις] πόλει *D.L.* *no. 16* ἐχθρόν] ἀλλότριον *Par.*₁ *no. 17* μὴ μάχεσθαι—φρονεῖν] μὴ φιλοφρονεῖσθαι (φίλα φρονεῖν *Par.*₁) μὴδὲ μάχεσθαι *D.L., Par.*₁ || δύναται παρέχειν] σημαίνει *D.L., Par.*₁ *no. 18* οἰκέτας μεθύοντας] οἰκέτην πάροινον *D.L.* || εἰ δὲ μὴ—παροινεῖν] δοκεῖν γὰρ παροινεῖν *D.L.* *no. 19* δεσπότας—κτῆσθαι] λάβης, δεσπότας κτῆσθαι τοὺς συγγενέας *D.L., Par.*₁ (δεσπότας καὶ οὐ συγγενεῖς) *no. 20* μὴ ἐπιγελᾶν τοῖς σκωπτομένοις· ἀπεχθήσεσθαι γὰρ τούτοις *D.L.* || ἀπεχθῆς—σκωπτομένοις *om. Par.*₁ *no. 21* εὐποροῦντα] εὐτυχῶν *D.L.* || ἀποροῦντα] ἀπορήσας *D.L.* || μὴ ὑπερήφανος γίνου εὐπορήσας *Par.*₁

2: Solon, son of Execestides, of Athens said:

1. Nothing in excess. 2. Do not sit down in judgment; if you do, you will be hateful to the person caught. 3. Avoid the pleasure which produces pain. 4. Maintain nobility of character: that inspires more confidence than an oath. 5. Strike down words with silence, silence with timing. 6. Do not lie, but speak the truth. 7. Apply yourself to what is worth your while. 8. Do not be in what you say more righteous than your parents. 9. Do not make friends quickly nor be quick to drop those you have got. 10. When you have learned to let yourself be governed, then you will know how to govern (others). 11. If you expect others to give account (of their actions), then be prepared to do so yourself. 12. Do not advise what is most pleasant, but what is best. 13. Do not be overbold towards your fellow-citizens. 14. Have no dealings with bad persons. 15. Consult the gods. 16. Revere your friends. 17. Do not make assertions about what you have not seen. 18. Keep your knowledge to yourself. 19. Be gentle towards those close to you. 20. Figure out what is unclear from what is clear.

*Par.*₁ *no. 6* ἀλλ' ἀλήθευε *deest in D.L.* *no. 9* οὐς—ἀποδοκίμαζε *om. Par.*₁ || *alter* ταχὺ *om. D.L.* *no. 10* ἄρχε πρῶτον μαθὼν ἄρχεσθαι *D.L.*: μὴ ἄρχε πρὸ τοῦ μαθεῖν ἄρχεσθαι· ἐπιστήσῃ γὰρ ἑτέρους εὐθύνειν *Par.*₁ *no. 12* βέλτιστα] ἄριστα *D.L.*: κράτιστα *Par.*₁ *no. 15* θεοὺς τίμα *D.L.*: θεοῖς θῦε εὐσεβῶς *Par.*₁ *no. 17* λέγε] λάλει *Par.*₁ *no. 18* ἰδὼν δὲ σίγα *Par.*₁ *una cum no. 17*

γ' Χείλων Δαμαγήτου Λακεδαιμόνιος ἔφη·

1. γνῶθι σαυτόν. 2. πίνων, μὴ πολλὰ λάλει· ἁμαρτήση 35
 γάρ. 3. μὴ ἀπείλει τοῖς ἐλευθέροις· οὐ γὰρ δίκαιον. 4. μὴ
 κακολόγει τοὺς πλησίον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀκούσῃ ἐφ' οἷς
 λυπηθήσῃ. 5. ἐπὶ τὰ δεῖπνα τῶν φίλων βραδέως πορεύου,
 ἐπὶ δὲ τὰς ἀτυχίας ταχέως. 6. γάμους εὐτελεῖς ποιοῦ. 7.
 τὸν τετελευτηκότα μακάριζε. 8. πρεσβύτερον σέβου. 9. 40
 τὸν τὰ ἀλλότρια περιεργαζόμενον μίσει. 10. ζημίαν
 αἰροῦ μᾶλλον ἢ κέρδος αἰσχύρον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἅπαξ
 λυπήσῃ, τὸ δὲ αἰεὶ. 11. τῷ δυστυχοῦντι μὴ ἐπιγέλα. 12.
 τραχὺς ὢν, ἥσυχον σεαυτὸν πάρεχε, ὅπως σε αἰσχύ-
 νωνται μᾶλλον, ἢ φοβῶνται. 13. τῆς ἰδίας οἰκίας προ- 45
 στάτει. 14. ἡ γλῶσσά σου μὴ προτρεχέτω τοῦ νοῦ. 15.
 θυμοῦ κράτει. 16. μὴ ἐπιθύμει ἀδύνατα. 17a. ἐν ὁδῷ μὴ
 σπεῦδε προάγειν, 17b. μηδὲ τὴν χεῖρα κινεῖν· μανικὸν
 γάρ. 18. νόμοις πείθου. 19. ἀδικοῦμενος διαλλάσσου·
 ὑβριζόμενος τιμωροῦ. 50

nos. 1, 2–13, 14, 15, 16–18 = nos. 21, 1–12, 14, 13, 16–19 Par.₁ no. 19 deest in Par.₁, cf. Mon. 19 no. 22 Par.₁ habet μηδὲν ἄγαν (Solonis no. 1), 23 ἐγγύα, πάρα δ' ἄτα (Thaletis no. 1) || no. 1 D.L. 1.40 (in vita Thaletis) no. 2 D.L. 1.69 no. 3 D.L. 1.70 no. 4 D.L. 1.69 nos. 5–18 D.L. 1.70 no. 19 deest in D.L. desunt in Stob. D.L. 1.70 μαντικήν μὴ ἐχθαίρειν (cf. no. 15 Par.₁ μάτην μὴ ἔλεγε· δόξεις γὰρ ἀσεβεῖν) et ἡρεμία χρησθαι (= no. 20 Par.₁)

no. 2 γλώττης κρατεῖν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν συμποσίῳ D.L. no. 3 μὴ ἀπειλεῖν μηδενί· γυναικῶδες γάρ D.L. no. 5 ταχύτερον ἐπὶ τὰς →

δ' Θαλῆς Ἑξαμίου Μιλήσιος ἔφη·

1. ἐγγύα, πάρα δ' ἄτα. 2. φίλων παρόντων καὶ
 ἀπόντων μέμνησο. 3. μὴ τὴν ὄψιν καλλωπίζου, ἀλλ' ἐν
 τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἴσθι καλός. 4. μὴ πλούτει κακῶς. 5.
 μή σε διαβαλλέτω λόγος πρὸς τοὺς πίστεως κεκοι- 55
 νωνηκότας. 6. κολακεύειν γονεῖς μὴ ὅκνει. 7. μὴ προσ-
 δέχου τὸ φαῦλον. 8. οἷους ἂν ἐράνους ἐνέγκῃς τοῖς
 γονεῦσι, τούτους αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ γήρᾳ παρὰ τῶν τέκνων
 προσδέχου. 9. χαλεπὸν τὸ εὖ γνῶναι. 10. ἥδιστον τὸ
 ἐπιθυμίας τυχεῖν. 11. ἀνιαρὸν ἀργία. 12. βλαβερὸν 60

3. Chilon, son of Demagetes, of Lacedaemon said:

1. Know yourself. 2. When drinking, do not talk much; for you will make mistakes. 3. Do not threaten free-born people; it is not just. 4. Do not abuse your neighbors; if you do, you will hear things that will hurt you. 5. Be slow in attending your friends' dinners, quick in attending to their misfortunes. 6. When you marry, do it cheaply. 7. Bless the dead. 8. Respect an older person. 9. Hate anyone meddling with another person's affairs. 10. Prefer loss to shameful gain; for the former will hurt once, the latter always. 11. Do not laugh at anyone's misfortune. 12. If you are in a savage mood, keep yourself calm, in order that people may feel shame before you rather than fright. 13. Be master of your own house. 14. Do not let your tongue run faster than your mind. 15. Control your temper. 16. Do not desire the impossible. 17a. On the street, do not hurry to press forward (17b.) nor gesticulate too much, for that will make you look like a madman. 18. Obey laws. 19. When treated unjustly, arrange a settlement; when treated insultingly, take revenge.

ἀτυχίας τῶν φίλων ἢ ἐπὶ τὰς εὐτυχίας πορεύεσθαι *D.L.* no. 7 τὸν τεθνηκότα μὴ κακολογεῖν *D.L.* no. 8 γῆρας τιμᾶν *D.L.* no. 9 cf. φυλάττειν ἑαυτὸν *D.L.* no. 10 τὸ μὲν γὰρ—ἀεὶ] ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἄπαξ ἐλύπησε, τὸ δὲ διὰ παντός *D.L.* no. 11 τῷ δυστυχοῦντι] ἀτυχοῦντι *D.L.*, *Par.*₁ no. 12 ἰσχυρὸν ὄντα πρῶτον εἶναι, ὅπως οἱ πλησίον αἰδῶνται μᾶλλον ἢ φοβῶνται *D.L.* no. 13 μανθάνειν τῆς αὐτοῦ οἰκίας καλῶς προστατεῖν *D.L.* || *post* προστατεῖ *add.* ὀρθῶς *Par.*₁ no. 17a ἐν ὁδῷ μὴ σπεύδειν *D.L.*: μὴ σπεῦδε λαλῶν· ἄνοια γάρ *Par.*₁ no. 17b μηδὲ—κινεῖν] λέγοντα μὴ κινεῖν τὴν χεῖρα *D.L.*, *Par.*₁

4: Thales, son of Examius, of Miletus said:

1. Go surety and ruin is at hand. 2. Remember your friends, be they present or absent. 3. Do not beautify your appearance, but be beautiful in what you do. 4. Do not grow rich by ill means. 5. Do not let words alienate you from those who have a share in your trust. 6. Do not hesitate to flatter your parents. 7. Do not accept what is mean. 8. In old age accept from your children services similar to those you rendered your parents. 9. Good judgment is difficult. 10. Sweetest (of all) is the attainment of one's desires.

ἀκρασία. 13. βαρὺ ἀπαιδευσία. 14. δίδασκε καὶ μάν-
θανε τὸ ἄμεινον. 15. ἀργὸς μὴ ἴσθι, μηδ' ἂν πλουτῆς. 16.
κακὰ ἐν οἴκῳ κρύπτε. 17. † φθόνου χάριν μὴ οἰκτείρου.
18. μέτρῳ χρῶ. 19. μὴ πᾶσι πίστευε. 20. ἄρχων κόσμει
σεαυτόν.

65

*nos. 2–10, 12–16, 18–20 = nos. 1–9, 10–14, 15–17 Par.₁ nos. 1 et 11,
17 desunt in Par.₁, cf. Chilonis no. 23 Par.₁ et Thaletis Mon. 5 no. 18
Par.₁ habet ἀγαθὸς ἴσθι || no. 1 D.L. 1.73 (in vita Chilonis) nos. 2–
5 D.L. 1.37 no. 8 D.L. 1.37 nos. 9–10 D.L. 1.36 no. 13 D.L.
1.37 nos. 6, 7, 11–12, 14–20 desunt in D.L.*

no. 3 ἀλλ' ἐν] ἀλλὰ D.L. no. 7 πατρὸς λοιδορίαν μὴ δέχου· φαῦλον →

ε' Πιπτακὸς Ὑρραδίου Λέσβιος ἔφη·

1. καιρὸν γνῶθι. 2. ὃ μέλλεις ποιεῖν, μὴ λέγε·
ἀποτυχὼν γὰρ καταγελασθήσῃ. 3. τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύουσιν χρῶ.
4. ὅσα νεμεσᾷς τῷ πλησίον, αὐτὸς μὴ ποίει. 5. ἀπρα-
γοῦντα μὴ ὀνειδίζε· ἐπὶ γὰρ τούτοις νέμεσις θεῶν 70
κάθεται. 6. παρακαταθήκας ἀπόδος. 7. ἀνέχου ὑπὸ τῶν
πλησίον μικρὰ ἐλαττούμενος. 8. τὸν φίλον κακῶς μὴ
λέγε, μηδ' εὖ τὸν ἐχθρόν· ἀσυλλόγιστον γὰρ τὸ τοιοῦτον.
9. δεινὸν συνιδεῖν τὸ μέλλον, ἀσφαλὲς τὸ γενόμενον. 10.
πιστὸν γῇ, ἄπιστον θάλασσα. 11. ἅπληστον κέρδος. 12. 75
κτῆσαι αἰδία· θεραπείαν, εὐσέβειαν, παιδείαν, σωφρο-
σύνην, φρόνησιν, ἀλήθειαν, πίστιν, ἐμπειρίαν, ἐπιδεξι-
ότητα, ἐταιρείαν, ἐπιμέλειαν, οἰκονομίαν, τέχνην.

*nos. 2–8, 9, 10, 11, 12 = nos. 1–7, 10, 11, 11, 12 Par.₁ no. 1 deest in
Par.₁ no. 8 Par.₁ habet εὐχαρίσται παντί et no. 9 Par.₁ χρόνος
μέγιστον ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἀρμόσει, φρένας || no. 1 D.L. 1.79 nos. 2; 5–
6; 8 D.L. 1.78 nos. 9–10 D.L. 1.77 no. 12 D.L. 1.78 nos. 3–4,
7, 11 desunt in D.L.*

*no. 2 ποιεῖν] πράττειν D.L. || καταγελασθήσῃ] γελασθήσῃ D.L.,
Par.₁ no. 5 ἀτυχίαν μὴ ὀνειδίζειν, νέμεσιν αἰδόμενον D.L. no.
6 ante ἀπόδος add. λαβόντα D.L., λαβὼν Par.₁ no. 8 φίλον μὴ
λέγειν κακῶς, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ἐχθρόν D.L.: τὸν φίλον κακῶς μὴ λέγε·
μηδὲ τὸν ἐχθρόν φίλον ἡγοῦ Par.₁ no. 9 πρὸς τοὺς πυνθανομένους
τί ... ἀφανές, (ἔφη) 'τὸ μέλλον' D.L. || τὸ γενόμενον ἀφανές, τὸ
μέλλον μήκιστον Par.₁ no. 10 γῇ πιστόν, θάλασσα ἄπιστον
κέρδος Par.₁ no. 11 v. ad no. 10 no. 12 εὐσέβειαν ἀσκεῖν. →*

11. Idleness is annoying. 12. Lack of self-restraint is harmful. 13. Stupidity is burdensome. 14. Teach and learn what is better. 15. Do not be idle, even if you are rich. 16. Hide your troubles indoors. 17. †To avoid envy† do not show pity. 18. Use moderation. 19. Do not trust everyone. 20. When in office, dress with dignity.

γάρ *Par.*₁ no. 8 οἷους] οὓς *D.L.*, *Par.*₁ || τούτους—προσδέχου] τοὺς αὐτοὺς προσδέχου καὶ παρὰ τῶν τέκνων *D.L.* no. 9 ἐρωτηθεὶς τί δύσκολον, ἔφη, ‘τὸ ἑαυτὸν γνῶναι’ *D.L.* no. 10 ἐρωτηθεὶς ... τί ἥδιστον, ‘τὸ ἐπιτυχᾶναι’ *D.L.* no. 11 cf. ἀργίαν μὴ φίλει *Mon.* no. 12 cf. βλαβερὸν ἐγγύη *Par.*₁ no. 13 cf. ἐρωτηθεὶς ... τίς εὐδαίμων, ‘ὁ ... τὴν δὲ φύσιν εὐπαίδευτος’ *D.L.* no. 16 τὰ καλὰ ἐν οἴκῳ κρύπτε *Par.*₁ no. 17 v. *T.-P. ad Par.*₁ no. 14 p. 203

5: Pittacus, son of Hyrrhadius, of Lesbos said:

1. Know the right moment. 2. Do not let on what you are going to do; for if you fail, you will be laughed at. 3. Make use of your friends. 4. Do not do yourself what you resent in your neighbor. 5. Do not reproach anyone with his misfortune; for the wrath of the gods sits heavily on those who do. 6. Return what has been deposited with you. 7. Put up with being outstripped by your neighbors in small things. 8. Do not speak ill of a friend nor well of an enemy; for such conduct is illogical. 9. It is frightening to survey the future but safe to survey the past. 10. The earth is to be trusted, the sea to be distrusted. 11. Desire of gain is insatiable. 12. Acquire things which last forever: care, piety, education, temperance, practical wisdom, truthfulness, trust(worthiness), experience, tact, comradeship, diligence, frugality, skill(fulness).

σωφροσύνην φιλεῖν. ἀλήθειαν ἔχειν, πίστιν, ἐμπειρίαν, ἐπιδεξιότητα, ἑταιρίαν, ἐπιμέλειαν *D.L.* || αἰδία *om.* *Par.*₁ || ante θεραπείαν *add.* καλοκαγαθίαν *Par.*₁ || φρόνησιν *ei* ἐπιμέλειαν—τέχνην *om.* *Par.*₁

ζ' Βίας Τευταμίδου Πριηνεὺς ἔφη·

1. οἱ πλεῖστοι ἄνθρωποι κακοί. 2. ἐς τὸ ἔσοπτρον [ἔφη] 80
ἐμβλέψαντα δεῖ, εἰ μὲν καλὸς φαίνει, καλὰ ποιεῖν, εἰ δὲ
αἰσχροῦς, τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἐλλίπες διορθοῦσθαι τῇ
καλοκαγαθία. 3. βραδέως ἐγχείρει· ὃ δ' ἂν ἄρξη,
διαβεβαιοῦ. 4. μίσει τὸ ταχὺ λαλεῖν, μὴ ἀμάρτης·
μετάνοια γὰρ ἀκολουθεῖ. 5. μήτ' εὐήθης ἴσθι, μήτε 85
κακοήθης. 6. ἀφροσύνην μὴ προσδέχου. 7. φρόνησιν
ἀγάπα. 8. περὶ θεῶν λέγε, ὡς εἰσὶ θεοί. 9. νόει τὸ
πραττόμενον. 10. ἄκουε πολλά. 11. λάλει καίρια. 12.
πένης ὢν πλουσίοις μὴ ἐπιτίμα, ἦν μὴ μέγα ὠφελῆς. 13.
ἀνάξιον ἄνδρα μὴ ἐπαίνει διὰ πλοῦτον. 14. πείσας λάβε, 90
μὴ βιασάμενος. 15. ὃ τι ἂν ἀγαθὸν πράσσης, θεοὺς, μὴ
σεαυτὸν αἰτιῶ. 16. κτῆσαι ἐν μὲν νεότητι εὐπραξίαν, ἐν
δὲ τῷ γήρᾳ σοφίαν. 17. ἔξεις ἔργῳ μνήμην, καιρῷ
εὐλάβειαν, τρόπῳ γενναιότητα, πόνῳ ἐγκράτειαν, φόβῳ
εὐσέβειαν, πλούτῳ φιλίαν, λόγῳ πειθῷ, σιγῇ κόσμον, 95
γνώμῃ δικαιοσύνην, τόλμῃ ἀνδρείαν, πράξει δυνα-
στείαν, δόξῃ ἡγεμονίαν.

*nos. 2–10, 12–15, 16–17 = nos. 1–8, 10–13, 14 Par.₁ nos. 1 et 11
desunt in Par.₁ || no. 1 D.L. 1.87 et 1.88 nos. 3–4 D.L. 1.87 nos.
7–8; 13–16 D.L. 1.88 nos. 2, 5, 6, 9–12, 17 desunt in D.L.*

*no. 2 καλὰ ποιεῖν] ἄξια τούτου πράττε Par.₁ || φύσεως] ὄψεως Par.₁ ||
διορθοῦσθαι] ὠραίζε Par.₁ no. 3 βραδέως ἐγχείρει τοῖς πραττο-
μένοις· ὃ δ' ἂν ἔλη, βεβαίως τηρῶν διάμενε D.L.: βραδέως ἐγχείρει·
ὃ δ' ἂν ἔλη, διάμενε βεβαίως Par.₁ no. 4 μὴ ταχὺ λάλει· μανίαν →*

η' Περίανδρος Κυψέλου Κορίνθιος ἔφη·

1. μελέτα τὸ πᾶν. 2a. καλὸν ἡσυχία· 2b. ἐπισφαλὲς
προπέτεια. 3. κέρδος αἰσχροῦς φύσεως κατηγορία. 4. 100
δημοκρατία κρεῖττον τυραννίδος. 5. αἱ μὲν ἡδοναὶ
θνηταί, αἱ δ' ἀρεταὶ ἀθάνατοι. 6. εὐτυχῶν μὲν μέτριος
ἴσθι, ἀτυχῶν δὲ φρόνιμος. 7. φειδόμενον κρεῖττον ἀπο-
θανεῖν ἢ ζῶντα ἐνδεῖσθαι. 8. σεαυτὸν ἄξιον παρα-
σκεύαζε τῶν γονέων. 9. ζῶν μὲν ἐπαινοῦ, ἀποθανόντων δὲ 105
μακαρίζου. 10. φίλοις εὐτυχοῦσι καὶ ἀτυχοῦσιν ὁ αὐτὸς
ἴσθι. 11. ὃν ἂν ἐκὼν ὁμολογήσης πονηρόν, παράβαινε.
12. λόγων ἀπορρήτων ἐκφορὰν μὴ ποιοῦ. 13. λοιδοροῦ ὡς

6: Bias, son of Teutamides, of Priene said:

1. Most people are evil. 2. If a look into the mirror shows you to be a fine person [he said], you must do fine things; if an ugly one, you must compensate for your natural deficiency with fineness of character. 3. Be slow to undertake things, but whatever you have started, carry that out to the end. 4. Hate speaking quickly, to avoid mistakes, for regret follows. 5. Be neither naïve nor suspicious. 6. Do not welcome folly. 7. Cherish wisdom. 8. About gods, say that there are gods. 9. Mark what is being done. 10. Keep your ears open to many things. 11. Say what suits the moment. 12. If you are poor, do not reprove rich people, unless you render a great service by it. 13. Do not praise an unworthy man because of his wealth. 14. Use persuasion, not violence, to get what you want. 15. Whatever good you do, give the gods the credit for it, not yourself. 16. Attain good conduct while young and wisdom in old age. 17. You will have remembrance due to deeds, discretion to moderation, nobility to character, self-control to exertion, piety to fear, friendship to wealth, persuasion to speech, dignity to silence, justice to insight, courage to daring, power to action, leadership to reputation.

γὰρ ἐμφαίνει *D.L.* || μὴ ἀμάρτης—ἀκολουθεῖ] ἄνοια γάρ *Par.*₁ *no.* 8 θεοὶ *om.*
D.L. || περὶ θεοῦ μὴ λέγε κακῶς· ὅτι δ' ἔστιν ἄκουε *Par.*₁ *no.* 15 ἐὰν ἀγαθὸν
 πράττης, θεῷ ἀναπτε, μὴ σεαυτὸν αἰτιῶ *Par.*₁ || θεοὺς—αἰτιῶ] εἰς θεοὺς
 ἀνάπεμπε *D.L.* *no.* 16 ἐφόδιον ἀπὸ νεότητος εἰς γῆρας ἀναλάμβανε σοφίαν·
 βεβαιότερον γὰρ τοῦτο τῶν ἄλλων κτημάτων *D.L.* || εὐπραξίαν] εὐταξίαν
*Par.*₁ *no.* 17 ἔξεις *om.* *Par.*₁ || ἀνδρείαν] ἀνδραγαθίαν *Par.*₁ || *post*
 δυναστείαν *add.* φύσει εὐγένειαν *Par.*₁

7: Periander, son of Cypselus, of Corinth said:

1. Practice is everything. 2a. Tranquility is a fine thing; 2b. rashness trips one up. 3. Desire of shameful gain is an indictment of one's nature. 4. Democracy is better than despotic rule. 5. Pleasures are mortal, virtues immortal. 6. Be moderate in good fortune, prudent in bad fortune. 7. It is better to die a thrifty man than to live in want. 8. Render yourself worthy of your parents. 9. Be praised while alive, and blessed when dead. 10. Be the same person to friends in prosperity and in adversity. 11. Whomever you freely admit to be evil, pass (him) by. 12. Do not bring secrets out into the open. 13. Give abuse as though you will soon be a friend.

ταχὺ φίλος ἐσόμενος. 14. τοῖς μὲν νόμοις παλαιοῖς χρῶ,
τοῖς δ' ὅσοις προσφάτοις. 15. μὴ μόνον τοὺς ἀμαρτάν- 110
οντας κόλαζε, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς μέλλοντας κώλυε. 16.
δυστυχῶν κρύπτε, ἵνα μὴ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς εὐφράνης.

*nos. 2a–2b, 3–16 = nos. 2–3, 4–17 Par.₁ no. 1 Par.₁ habet πᾶσιν
ἄρεσκε (Biantis D.L. 1.85) || no. 1 D.L. 1.99 nos. 2–5 D.L. 1.97
nos. 6; 10–11; 12; 15 D.L. 1.98 nos. 7–9, 13–14, 16 desunt in D.L.*

*no. 1 μελέτη D.L., Par.₁ no. 3 κέρδος αἰσχρόν (post αἰσχρόν
lacunam 8–9 litt. habet F) D.L. no. 4 κρεῖττον] κρεῖττον D.L. Ω:
κρεῖττων D.L. Φ, Par.₁ no. 5 θνηταί] φθαρταί D.L. || ἀρεταί] τιμαὶ
D.L., Par.₁ no. 6 ἀτυχῶν] δυστυχῶν D.L., Par.₁ no. 10 εὐτυχοῖσι
καὶ om. Par.₁ no. 11 ὃ ἂν ὁμολογήσης, διατήρει D.L.: ὃ ἂν ἐκὼν
ὁμολογήσης, ποίει· πονηρὸν γὰρ τὸ παραβῆναι Par.₁ no. 15 κώλυε]
κόλαζε omisso κόλαζε D.L. no. 16 δυστυχῶν] δυστυχίαν Par.₁*

Religio

cf. quae dicit Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.76
= 1.20–1 de paeanibus a Demetrio factis, et dictum
Demetrii in *Gnomologio Vaticano* 743, no 254 = 71

14. The laws you use should be old, the dishes you cook fresh. 15. Do not only punish those who are making mistakes, but also restrain those who are on the point of doing so. 16. Hide your misfortune, lest you gladden your enemies.

Religion

cp. what Diogenes Laertius says in his *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.76 = 1.20–1 about paeans composed by Demetrius, and the saying of Demetrius in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 743, no. 254 =
71

Politica

cf. dicta Demetrii in 1.52–3; 112–17; 12.7–8; 38.4–6; 73–75; 77–79; 82A.6–21; 83.7–8; 90.14–17; 116A.17–20; 26–7; 116B.8–10; 143.19–22

Inscriptiones librorum

88 Tabula inscriptionum ad opera politica spectantium

- 1 Περὶ τῆς δεκαετίας α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.86
- 2 Ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτείας α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.85
- 3 Ἀθηναίων καταδρομὴ α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.101
- 4 Περὶ δημαγωγίας α΄ β΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = 1.67
- 5 Στρατηγικῶν α΄ β΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = 1.71
- 6 Ἀρχόντων Ἀναγραφὴ] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 1.22 = 93.4; 2.7 = 94.7 (ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφῇ); Marcellinus, *Vita Thucydidis* 32 = 92.13 (ἐν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν)
- 7 Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας α΄ β΄ γ΄ δ΄ ε΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = 1.65; *Tabula Rhodiensis* col. I 5–6 = 80.5–6 (Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας πέ[ντε]); Harpocration, *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos* s.v. παράστασις = 98.14 (ἐν τοῖς Περὶ νομοθεσίας); s.v. Ἐρκειος Ζεύς = 100.7–8 (ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας); s.v. σκαφηφόροι = 101.5–6 (ἐν γ΄ Νομοθεσίας); Photius, *Lexicon* s.v. παράστασις (2.336.24–25 Porson) = app. 98 (ἐν τοῖς Περὶ νομοθεσίας); s.v. σκαφηφόροι (2.446.21 Porson) = app. 101 (ἐν γ΄ Νομοθεσίας); *Suda* s.v. παράστασις (no. 443, LG 1.4.42.4 Adler) = app. 98 (ἐν τοῖς Περὶ νομοθεσίας); s.v. σκαφηφόροι (no. 544, LG 1.4.373.24 Adler) = app. 101 (ἐν γ΄ Νομοθεσίας); *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense* s.v. παράστασις (67.9–20 Houtsma) = app. 98 (ἐν τοῖς

Politics

cp. the sayings of Demetrius in **1.52–3**; **112–17**; **12.7–8**; **38.4–6**; **73–75**; **77–79**; **82A.6–21**; **83.7–8**; **90.14–17**; **116A.17–20**; **26–7**; **116B.8–10**; **143.19–22**

Titles of Books

88 List of Titles Referring to Political Works

- 1 *On the Ten Years*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.86**
- 2 *In Defence of the Constitution*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.85**
- 3 *A Denunciation of the Athenians*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.101**
- 4 *On Leadership of the people*, 2 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.67**
- 5 *Matters of Strategy*, 2 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.71**
- 6 *List of Archons*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.22 = **93.4**; 2.7 = **94.7** (“in his *List of Archons*”); Marcellinus, *The Life of Thucydides* 32 = **92.13** (“in his *Archons*”)
- 7 *On Legislation at Athens*, 5 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.65**; *Rhodian Book Catalogue* col. I 5–6 = **80.5–6** (“*On Legislation at Athens*, five books”); Harpocration, *Lexicon on the Ten Attic Orators* under *plaintiff’s deposit* = **98.14** (“in his books *On Legislation*”); under *Zeus of the Enclosure* = **100.7–8** (“in his books *On the Legislation of the Athenians*”); under *bowl-carriers* = **101.5–6** (“in (book) 3 of *Legislation*”); Photius, *Lexicon* under *plaintiff’s deposit* (2.336.24–5 Porson) = **app. 98** (“in his books *On Legislation*”); under *bowl-carriers* (2.446.21 Porson) = **app. 101** (“in book 3 of *Legislation*”); *Suda* under *plaintiff’s deposit* (no. 443, *LG* 1.4.42.4 Adler) = **app. 98** (“in his books *On Legislation*”); under *bowl-carriers* (no. 544, *LG* 1.4.373.24 Adler) = **app. 101** (“in book 3 of *Legislation*”); *Cambridge Rhetorical Lexicon* under *plaintiff’s deposit* (67.9–20 Houtsma) = **app. 98** (“in his books *On Legislation*”); under

- Περὶ νομοθεσίας); s.v. κυρία ἐκκλησία = **99.1–2** (ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ περὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων νομοθεσίας)
- 8 Ἐκκλησία ἔνορκος α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.105**
- 9 Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι πολιτειῶν α΄ β΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = **1.66**; Strabo, *Geographica* 9.1.20 = **19.12–13** (sine inscriptione libri); *Tabula Rhodiensis* col. I 7 = **80.7** (Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι πολι[τειῶν])
- 10 Περὶ πολιτικῆς α΄, β΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = **1.68**
- 11 Περὶ νόμων α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = **1.69**
- 12 Περὶ νόμων α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.96**; fort. geminatio inscriptionis no. 11
- 13 Σωκράτης α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.79**; 9.15 = **106.5**; 9.57 = **107.4–5**; 9.37 = **108.1** (ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ); Plutarchus, *Aristides* 1.2 = **102.7–8**; 27.4 = **104.12** (ἐν τῷ Σωκράτει); Eudociae *Violarium* 329 (BT 238.16 Flach) = **app. 107** (ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ)
- 14 Ἀριστείδης α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.82**
- 15 Ἀριστόμαχος α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.83**
- 16 Κλέων α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.78**; *Tabula Rhodiensis* col. I 3 = **80.3** (Κλέων ἔ[ν])
- 17 Φαιδώνδας α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.76**; *Tabula Rhodiensis* col. I 4 = **80.4** (Φαιδώνδας ἢ περὶ ο[υ])
- 18 Περὶ γάμου α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.93**
- 19 Περὶ εἰρήνης α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.95**
- 20 Περὶ καιροῦ α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.98**

Scripta Politica

89

Polybius, *Historiae* 12.13.1; 6–12 (BT 3.193.22–194.2; 194.14–195.15 Büttner-Wobst)

- 1 ὅτι Τίμαιός φησι Δημοχάρην ἡταιρηκέναι μὲν τοῖς ἄνω μέρεσι τοῦ σώματος, οὐκ εἶναι δ' ἄξιον τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ φυσᾶν, ὑπερβεβηκέναι δὲ τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι τὰ Βότρυος ὑπομνήματα καὶ τὰ Φιλαινίδος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀναισ-

Regular Assembly = **99.1–2** (“in the second book of *On the Legislation of the Athenians*”)

- 8 *The Sworn Assembly*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.105**
- 9 *On Constitutions at Athens*, 2 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.66**; Strabo, *Geography* 9.1.20 = **19.12–13**, where the words do not occur as a title; *Rhodian Book Catalogue* col. I 7 = **80.7** (“*On Constitutions at Athens*”)
- 10 *On (the Art of) Politics*, 2 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.68**
- 11 *On Laws*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.69**
- 12 *On Laws*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.96**; perhaps a repetition of title no. 11
- 13 *Socrates*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.79**; 9.15 = **106.5**; 9.57 = **107.4–5**; 9.37 = **108.1** (“In the *Apology of Socrates*”); Plutarch, *Aristides* 1.2 = **102.7–8**; 27.4 = **104.12** (“in his *Socrates*”); Eudociae *Bed of Violets* 329 (BT 238.16 Flach) = **app. 107** (“In the *Apology of Socrates*”)
- 14 *Aristides*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.82**
- 15 *Aristomachus*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.83**
- 16 *Cleon*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.78**; *Rhodian Book Catalogue* col. I 3 = **80.3** (“*Cleon*, one book”)
- 17 *Phaedondas*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.76**; *Rhodian Book Catalogue* col. I 4 = **80.4** (“*Phaedondas* or *On ...*”)
- 18 *On Marriage*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.93**
- 19 *On Peace*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.95**
- 20 *On the Right Moment*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.98**

Political Writings

- 89** Polybius, *Histories* 12.13.1; 6–12 (BT 3.193.22–194.2; 194.14–195.15 Büttner-Wobst)

- 1 That according to Timaeus, Demochares committed fornication with the upper parts of his body, was not worthy to blow the sacred fire, and in his (erotic) practices went beyond the writings of Botrys and Philaenis and the other pornographers; ...

- 6 χυντογράφων · ... διὸ καὶ δοκεῖ μοι Τίμαιος οὐχ οὕτως 5
 Δημοχάρους κατηγορεῖν ὡς Ἀθηναίων, εἰ τοιοῦτον
 132 W 7 βίους ἐνεχείριζον. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι τούτων οὐδέν. οὐ γὰρ
 ἂν Ἀρχέδικος ὁ κωμωδιογράφος ἔλεγε ταῦτα μόνος περὶ
 8 Δημοχάρους, ὡς Τίμαιός φησιν, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ μὲν ἂν τῶν 10
 Ἀντιπάτρου φίλων, καθ' οὗ πεπαρρησίασται πολλὰ καὶ
 δυνάμενα λυπεῖν οὐ μόνον αὐτὸν Ἀντίπατρον, ἀλλὰ
 καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνου διαδόχους καὶ φίλους γεγονότας,
 πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἀντιπεπολιτευμένων, ὧν ἦν καὶ Δημήτριος
 9 ὁ Φαληρεύς. οὗ ἑκεῖνος οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν πεποίηται 15
 κατηγορίαν ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις, φάσκων αὐτὸν γεγονέναι
 τοιοῦτον προστάτην τῆς πατρίδος καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις
 σεμνύνεσθαι κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν, ἐφ' οἷς ἂν καὶ τελώνης
 10 σεμνυνθεῖη βάναντος. ἐπὶ γὰρ τῷ πολλὰ καὶ λυσιτελῶς
 πωλεῖσθαι κατὰ τὴν πόλιν καὶ δασιλῇ τὰ πρὸς τὸν βίον 20
 ὑπάρχειν πᾶσιν, ἐπὶ τούτοις φησὶ μεγαλαυχεῖν αὐτόν ·
 11 καὶ διότι κοχλίας αὐτόματος βαδίζων προηγείτο τῆς
 πομπῆς αὐτῷ, σίαλον ἀναπτύων, σὺν δὲ τούτοις ὄνοι
 διεπέμποντο διὰ τοῦ θεάτρου, διότι δὴ πάντων τῶν τῆς
 Ἑλλάδος καλῶν ἢ πατρὶς παρακεχωρηκυῖα τοῖς ἄλλοις 25
 ἐποίει Κασάνδρῳ τὸ προσταττόμενον, ἐπὶ τούτοις αὐτὸν
 12 οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθαί φησιν. ἀλλ' ὅμως οὔτε Δημήτριος οὔτ'
 ἄλλος οὐδεὶς εἰρήκει περὶ Δημοχάρους τοιοῦτον οὐδέν.

1–28 = *Exc. Const. De Virt. et Vit.* 41 (2.2.129.24–7; 130.10–131.4
 Roos) = *Timae.* 566 F 35b FGrH 1–14 *Arched.* F 4 PCG K.-A. 1–
 5 *Democh.* 75 T 2 FGrH || ἦταιρ.—ἀναισχ.] = *Suda* δ 472 (LG
 1.2.49.7–9 Adler) 1–3 ἦταιρ.—φυσᾶν] = *Suda* η 617 (LG
 1.2.595.5–6 Adler) 3–5 ὑπερβεβ.—ἀναισχ.] = *Suda* β 411 (LG
 1.1.482.20–2 Adler) 10–27 *Democh.* 75 F 4 FGrH 14–28 228 F
 28 FGrH 17–21 ἐπὶ τούτοις—αὐτόν] = *Suda* β 93 (LG 1.1.452.27–
 30 Adler) 18–21 σεμνύνεσθαι—αὐτόν] cf. 19.10–13 22–3
 κοχλίας—ἀναπτύων] = *Suda* κ 2203 (LG 1.3.168.24–5 Adler) et σ 352 →

Strategica

- 90 Polybius, *Historiae* 10.24.3–7 (BT 3.88.24–89.14 Büttner-
 Wobst)

3 τί γὰρ ἀπειρότερον, ἅμα δ' ἐπισφαλέστερον ἄρ-

6 For this reason Timaeus in fact seems to me not to accuse
 Demochares so much as the Athenians, if they advanced such a
 7 such a man. But none of this is true. For, if it were true, the comic
 author Archedicus would not, as Timaeus will have it, have been
 8 the only one to say these things about Demochares: no, many of
 Antipater's associates would have done so—for he (Demochares)
 was quite outspoken about Antipater and said many things that
 could hurt not only Antipater himself, but also his successors and
 associates—and so would many of his political opponents, one of
 9 them being Demetrius of Phalerum. That man (Demochares) did
 after all make no trifling accusation against him (Demetrius) in
 his historical work, saying that he (Demetrius) had been such a
 leader of his fatherland as to be proud of those points in his ad-
 ministration that would make a common tax-collector proud of
 10 himself. The allegation is that he (Demetrius) used to boast about
 the fact that in the city many things could be bought at reasonable
 11 prices and that provisions were abundantly available to all. Also
 that he (Demetrius) was not ashamed of the fact that an automated
 snail led his procession,¹ spitting out saliva, and that to cap it all
 donkeys were sent right through the theatre; nor indeed that the
 city had ceded the championship of all the ideals of Hellas to the
 12 others and merely did what Cassander ordered. And yet, neither
 Demetrius nor anyone else has said anything of the sort² about
 Demochares.

¹ I.e., during his archonship in 308; see note 1 to 43A.

² I.e., as the allegation made by Archedicus as quoted by Timaeus.

(LG 1.4.353.11–12 Adler) 23 πομπῆς] cf. 43A.22 19 ἐπὶ Suda: ἐπεὶ P
 22 αὐτομάτως Suda utroque 23 ἀποπτύων Suda σ 352 23 ὄνοι Toup:
 ἄνοι c. signo compendii supra νοι P: ἄνθρωποι Valesius; v. CQ 39 (1945) 54–5;
 122 24 ante διότι lacunam indicat Jacoby, qui ἄνθρωποι legit || δὲ Valesius:
 δε (sine acc.) P

Matters of Strategy

90 Polybius, *Histories* 10.24.3–7 (BT 3.88.24–89.14 Büttner-Wobst)

3 For what is more lacking in experience and at the same time

χοντος, (ὅς) ὁρᾶται μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων,
 4 ὁρᾷ δ' οὐδένα; οὐ γὰρ στρατιωτικῆς ἐξουσίας, ἀλλ'
 ἡγεμονικῆς ἐμπειρίας, ἅμα δὲ καὶ δυνάμεως δεῖγμα δεῖ
 φέρειν τὸν ἱπάρχην ἐν ταῖς ἐξοπλισίαις, ποτὲ μὲν ἐν 5
 πρώτοις, ποτὲ δ' ἐν ἐσχάτοις, ποτὲ δὲ κατὰ μέσους
 5 γινόμενον. ὅπερ ὁ προειρημένος ἀνὴρ ἐποίει, παριπ-
 πεύων καὶ πάντας ἐφορῶν αὐτός, καὶ προσδιασαφῶν
 αὐτοῖς ἀποροῦσι καὶ διορθῶν ἐν ἀρχαῖς πᾶν τὸ
 6 διαμαρτανόμενον. ἦν δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα τελέως βραχέα καὶ 10
 σπάνια διὰ τὴν προγεγενημένην ἐν τοῖς κατὰ μέρος
 ἐπιμέλειαν.

123 W 7 Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἕως λόγου τὸ τοιοῦτον ὑπ-
 ἔδειξε, φήσας ὅτι καθάπερ ἐν οἰκοδομίαις, ἐὰν κατὰ
 μίαν πλίνθον θῆς καὶ καθ' ἓνα δόμον ἐπιμελείας τύχη τὸ 15
 παρατεθέν, οὕτως ἐν στρατοπέδῳ τὸ κατ' ἄνδρα καὶ
 κατὰ λόχον ἀκριβωθὲν ὅλην ποιεῖ τὴν δύναμιν ἰσχυράν.

13–17 228 F 27 FGrH 14–17 cf. Xen. Mem. 3.1.7

1 ... τί γὰρ] χώραν· ἀντὶ γὰρ F: corr. Schweighaeuser 2 <ὅς> add.
 Casaubon 8 προσδιασαφῶν Casaubon: προδ- codd. 15 πλίνθον
 θῆς Casaubon: πλύνθον θεῖς F: πλίνθον θεῖς D 11 παρατεθέν
 Schweig-haeuser: παραραγέν F: παρατιθέν Par. gr. 1651

91 Polybius, *Historiae* 36.2.1–4 (BT 4.438.9–18 Büttner-Wobst)

1 πάλαι δὲ τούτου κεκυρωμένου βεβαίως ἐν ταῖς
 ἐκάστων γνώμας καιρὸν ἐζήτουν ἐπιτήδειον καὶ
 2 πρόφασιν εὐσχήμονα πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτός. πολὺ γὰρ δὴ
 τούτου τοῦ μέρους ἐφρόντιζον Ῥωμαῖοι, καλῶς φρον-
 124 W 3 οὔντες· ἔνστασις γὰρ πολέμου κατὰ τὸν Δημήτριον 5
 δικαία μὲν δοκοῦσα εἶναι καὶ τὰ νικήματα ποιεῖ μείζω
 καὶ τὰς ἀποτεύξεις ἀσφαλεστέρας, ἀσχήμων δὲ καὶ
 4 φαύλη τάναντία ἀπεργάζεται· διὸ καὶ τότε περὶ τῆς τῶν
 ἐκτός διαλήψεως πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφερόμενοι παρ'
 ὀλίγον ἀπέστησαν τοῦ πολέμου. 10

1–10 = Exc. Const. De sent. 148 (4.202.8–15 Boissevain); cf. Plb. frg.
 99 et D.S. 32.5 5–8 228 F 29 FGrH

6 εἶναι δοκοῦσα Büttner-Wobst 8 τούναντίον Büttner-Wobst

more dangerous than a commander who is seen by all his subordi-
 4 nates, but does not see anyone himself? For under arms a cavalry
 commander should give proof of, not the qualifications of an ordi-
 nary rank and file soldier, but experience in leadership and at the
 same time ability as well, being present now amongst the front
 5 ranks, then at the rear and then again in the middle ranks. That is
 exactly what the man mentioned above (Philopoemen) did, riding
 past on his horse and personally inspecting all, giving additional
 instructions if they were at a loss what to do and correcting from
 6 the very beginning any mistake that was being made.¹ Instances
 of that kind, however, were quite trivial and rare on account of the
 care that had previously been taken in organizing each of the
 units.

7 Demetrius of Phalerum indicated this principle to the point of
 expressing it in words² by stating that just as in house-building if
 you lay on brick by brick and course by course what is laid next
 receives attention, so in an army detailed arrangements for every
 man and every file make up the strength of the entire force.

¹ As cavalry commander Philopoemen reformed the Achaean cavalry in 209 B.C. (Plu. *Phil.* 7).

² That is, merely in words, not in practice.

91 Polybius, *Histories* 36.2.1–4 (BT 4.438.9–18 Büttner-Wobst)

1 Although this¹ had long ago been firmly decided upon in their
 several minds, they looked for a suitable moment and for a pretext
 2 which would make a good impression on the outside world. In
 fact, the Romans used to give considerable attention to this point,
 3 and they were right to do so. For according to Demetrius a start to
 war that is accounted just both makes victories greater and fail-
 ures less dangerous, whereas one that makes a bad impression and
 4 is paltry produces the opposite result. Therefore at that time too,
 since they differed amongst themselves about the opinion of the
 outside world, they almost decided not to start the war.

¹ The decision to declare war on Carthage (Third Punic War). This was done in 150 B.C.

De institutis et magistratibus rei publicae

Magistratum index [Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή 92–4]

92 Marcellinus, *Vita Thucydidis* 32 (SGL 1.8.4–16 Alberti)

152 W

Δίδυμος δ' ἐν Ἀθήναις ἀπὸ τῆς φυγῆς ἐλθόντα βιαίῳ
θανάτῳ φησὶν ἀποθανεῖν· τοῦτο δέ φησι Ζώπυρον
ἱστορεῖν. τοὺς γὰρ Ἀθηναίους κάθοδον δεδωκέναι τοῖς
φυγάσι πλὴν τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν μετὰ τὴν ἥτταν τὴν ἐν
Σικελίᾳ· ἤκοντα οὖν αὐτὸν ἀποθανεῖν βία, καὶ τεθῆναι 5
ἐν τοῖς Κιμωνίοις μνήμασιν. καὶ καταγιγνώσκειν εὐή-
θειαν ἔφη τῶν νομιζόντων αὐτὸν ἐκτὸς μὲν τετελευτη-
κέναι, ἐπὶ γῆς δὲ τῆς Ἀττικῆς τεθάφθαι· ἢ γὰρ οὐκ ἂν
ἐτέθη ἐν τοῖς πατρώοις μνήμασιν, ἢ κρύβδην τεθεῖς οὐκ
ἂν ἔτυχεν οὔτε στήλης οὔτε ἐπιγράμματος, ἢ τῷ τάφῳ 10
προσκεϊμένη μηνύει τοῦ συγγραφέως τοῦνομα. ἀλλὰ
δῆλον ὅτι κάθοδος ἐδόθη τοῖς φεύγουσιν, ὥς καὶ Φιλό-
χορος λέγει καὶ Δημήτριος ἐν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν.

1–13 228 F 3 FGrH = Philoch. 328 F 137 FGrH = Did. F 27.3 Schmidt
p. 323–4 1–3 Zopyros F 6 FHG IV 533

2 φησὶν ἀποθανεῖν Vm: om. cett. 5 αὐτὸν desinit E 8 ἢ Bekker: εἰ
Pl: ἢ cett. 9 ἢ κρύβδην Casaubon: συλλήβδην codd.

93 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 1.22 (OCT 1.9.3–7 Long)

149 W

ἥν δὲ τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν, καθὰ καὶ Πλάτων φησί· καὶ
πρῶτος σοφὸς ὠνομάσθη ἄρχοντας Ἀθήνησι Δαμασίου,
καθ' ὃν καὶ οἱ ἐπτὰ σοφοὶ ἐκλήθησαν, ὥς φησι Δημήτριος
ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφῇ.

1–4 228 F 1 FGrH; Thales II A 1 DK I 67.10–14 1 Pl. Prt. 343A1–2

1 ἥν δὲ τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν suppl. Diels

94 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 2.7 (OCT 1.59.26–60.7 Long)

150 W

λέγεται δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ξέρξου διάβασιν εἴκοσιν ἐτῶν

On Procedures and Offices of the State

List of Archons [*List of Archons* 92–4]

- 92 Marcellinus, *The Life of Thucydides* 32 (SGL 1.8.4–16 Alberti)

Didymus says that he (Thucydides) died a violent death at Athens after his return from exile. He says that Zopyrus is his source for this. That as a matter of fact the Athenians had allowed the exiles, except for the Pisistratidae, to come back after the defeat in Sicily. That he did, therefore, come back and died a violent death, and was buried in the family vault of Cimon. He (Didymus) added that in his opinion those people were silly who thought that he (Thucydides) had died abroad, but had been buried in Attic soil. For in that case he would either not have been buried in the vault of his ancestors or, if he had been placed there secretly, he would not have got a tombstone or an epitaph, which, placed on the tomb as it is, makes known the historian's name. In any case, it is clear that the exiles were allowed to come back, as both Philochorus and Demetrius in his *Archons* say.

- 93 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 1.22 (OCT 1.9.3–7 Long)

He (Thales) was one of the Seven Wise Men, as Plato says too; and he was the first to be called "Wise," during Damasias' archonship at Athens.¹ At that time the Seven Wise Men too got their name, as Demetrius of Phalerum says in his *List of Archons*.

¹ In 583/2 B.C.

- 94 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 2.7 (OCT 1.59.26–60.7 Long)

It is stated that he (Anaxagoras) was twenty years old at the

εἶναι, βεβιωκέναι δὲ ἑβδομήκοντα δύο. φησὶ δ' Ἀπολλό-
 δωρος ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν τῇ ἑβδομη-
 κοστῇ Ὀλυμπιάδι, τεθνηκέναι δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει τῆς
 ἑβδομηκοστῆς ὀγδόης. ἤρξατο δὲ φιλοσοφεῖν Ἀθήνη- 5
 σιν ἐπὶ Καλλίου, ἐτῶν εἴκοσιν ὧν, ὥς φησι Δημήτριος ὁ
 Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφῇ, ἔνθα καί
 φασιν αὐτὸν ἐτῶν διατρίψαι τριάκοντα.

1-8 228 F 2 FGrH = *Apollod.* 244 F 31 FGrH = *Anaxag.* A 1 DK II
 5.19-25; cf. 84-5

5 ἑβδομηκοστῆς] ὀγδοηκοστῆς *Scaliger* 6 Καλλίου] *sive*
 Καλλιάρχου *Meursius*

De magistratibus [i.e. de demarchis]

95 Scholium in Aristophanis *Nubes* 37 (SA 1.3.1.256.11-20
 Koster)

145 W

Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ περὶ Κλεισθένους φησί· “κατέστησε
 καὶ δημάρχους τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντας ἐπιμέλειαν τοῖς
 πρότερον ναυκλάροις· καὶ γὰρ τοὺς δήμους ἀντὶ τῶν
 ναυκλαριῶν ἐποίησεν.” οἱ πρότερον ναύκλαροι, εἴτε ὑπὸ 5
 Σόλωνος κατασταθέντες εἴτε καὶ πρότερον. οὗτοι δὲ τὴν
 πομπὴν τῶν Παναθηναίων ἐκόσμου Κλεισθένους
 καταστήσαντος ἀντὶ ναυκλάρων. ἔστι δὲ δήμαρχος ὁ
 τὴν ἐπώνυμον ἀρχὴν ἄρχων· καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ὁ
 Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τοὺς κατὰ δῆμον ἄρχοντάς φησι.
 Δημήτριος δὲ ὁ Φαληρεὺς οὕτω φησί· “καὶ δημάρχους οἱ 10
 περὶ Σόλωνα καθίσταντο ἐν πολλῇ σπουδῇ, ἵνα οἱ κατὰ
 δῆμον ἄρχοντες διδῶσι καὶ λαμβάνωσι τὰ δίκαια παρ’
 ἀλλήλων.” ἔδει οὖν τὸν δήμαρχον ἀγαγεῖν εἰς τοὺς

time of Xerxes' crossing (of the Hellespont)¹ and that he lived to the age of seventy-two. Apollodorus in his *Chronicles* says that he was born in the seventieth Olympiad² and died in the first year of the †seventy-eighth†.³ He took up philosophy at Athens at the time of Callias,⁴ when twenty years old, as Demetrius of Phalerum says in his *List of Archons*, and they also say that he stayed there for thirty years.

¹ In 480/79 B.C.

² I.e., 500–496 B.C.

³ This date, 468/7 B.C., cannot be right. Scaliger's conjecture would bring the date down to Ol. 88,1 = 428/7 B.C. But see Jacoby *FGrH* II b 728 on 244 F 31.

⁴ Callias was archon in 456/5. He may have been confused with Calliades, who was archon in 480/79 B.C. On the whole entry see Jacoby *FGrH* II b 646 on 228 F 2.

On Offices [i.e. on demarchoi]

95 Scholium on Aristophanes' *Clouds* 37 (SA 1.3.1.256.11–20 Koster)

Aristotle says about Cleisthenes: "He also appointed *demarchoi* (head officers of the deme) with the same responsibilities as the former *nauklaroi*.¹ For he also established the demes to replace the (administrative units of) naucraries." The former *nauklaroi* are those who were instituted either by Solon or even earlier. These (*demarchoi*) used to organize the procession of the Panathenaea, Cleisthenes having appointed them in place of (the) *nauklaroi*. A *demarchos* is the official holding the eponymous office; and Asclepiades of Alexandria speaks (of them as) 'those holding office at the level of the deme'. Demetrius of Phalerum speaks (of them) as follows: "Solon and his associates were also very keen to appoint *demarchoi* so that those holding office at the level of the deme would act equitably in their relations with one another." What is relevant here² is that it was the duty of the *demarchos* to take to the homes (of the debtors) those who were

οἴκους τοὺς ἐνεχυριαζομένους.

1–14 *scholium editionis Aldinae proprium post scholium vetus* 37c || 228 F 31 FGrH = *Asclepiades* 339 F 2 FGrH 1–7 cf. *Phot.* 1.247.22–248.9 *Porson* 1–4 *Arist. Ath.* 21.5; cf. *Harp.* v 4 4–14 = *Solon T* 340 *Martina* (cf. *Solon F* 79–80 *Ruschenbusch*) 13–14 cf. *Harp.* δ 27; *praeterea* cf. *Pollux* 8.108–11; *Hsch.* δ 824; *Phot.* δ 244 = *Suda* δ 420 = *Lex. Sabb.* 48.4–8; *Suda* δ 421; *AB* 1.242.16–18

3 ναυκλάρους *sic constanter Ald.*: ναυκράροις *Arist., Harp.* || ἀντὶ τῶν →

De institutis rei publicae [Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας 98–9]

96A Pollux, *Onomasticon* 8.51–3 (LG 9.2.120.22–121.10 Bethe)

- 51 ἡ δ' εἰσαγγελία τέτακται ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγράφων δημοσίων ἀδικημάτων. κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν εἰσαγγελτικόν * * * (ἀμφοτέρως γὰρ λέγουσιν), ὃς κεῖται * * * περὶ ὧν οὐκ εἰσὶ νόμοι, ἀδικῶν δέ τις ἀλίσκεται ἢ ἄρχων ἢ ῥήτωρ, εἰς τὴν βουλὴν εἰσαγγελία δίδοται κατ' αὐτοῦ, κἂν μὲν 5 μέτρια ἀδικεῖν δοκῇ, ἢ βουλὴ ποιεῖται ζημίας ἐπιβολήν, 52 ἂν δὲ μείζω, παραδίδωσι δικαστηρίῳ· τὸ δὲ τίμημα, ὅ τι χρὴ παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτίσαι.

ἐγίνοντο δὲ εἰσαγγελίαι καὶ κατὰ τῶν καταλυόντων τὸν δῆμον ῥητόρων, ἢ μὴ τὰ ἄριστα τῷ δήμῳ λεγόντων, 10 ἢ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἄνευ τοῦ πεμφθῆναι ἀπελθόντων, ἢ προδόντων φρούριον ἢ στρατιάν ἢ ναῦς, ὡς Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ Νόμων.

- ὅτι δὲ ὁ εἰσαγγεῖλας καὶ οὐχ ἐλὼν ἀζήμιος ἦν, 53 Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Λυκόφρονος φησὶν. καίτοι γε ὁ 15 Θεόφραστος τοὺς μὲν ἄλλας γραφὰς γραψαμένους χιλίας τ' ὀφλίσκάνειν, εἰ τὸ πέμπτον τῶν ψήφων μὴ καταλάβοιεν, καὶ προσατιμοῦσθαι, τοὺς δὲ εἰσαγγέλλοντας μὴ ἀτιμοῦσθαι μὲν, ὀφλεῖν δὲ τὰς χιλίας· ἔοικε δὲ τοῦτο διὰ τοὺς ῥαδίως εἰσαγγέλλοντας ὕστερον 20 προσγεγράφθαι.

Δημοσθένης δὲ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μέδοντος καὶ κατὰ τῶν μὴ προσηκόντως τῇ ἐπικλήρῳ συνοικούντων γίνεσθαι τὰς εἰσαγγελίας λέγει.

χίλιοι δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὸν Σόλωνα τὰς εἰσαγγελίας 25

seizing a security for a debt.

¹ The text of the scholium has forms of *nauklaros*, the correct form being *naukraros*.

² In the *Clouds* Strepsiades is complaining about the *demarchos* who “is biting him in the bedding”: he is afraid his creditors will come and seize a security for his debts (35).

Arist.: αὐτῶν *Ald.* 5 ναυκλαριῶν: *Ald.*: ναυκραριῶν *Arist.*, *Harp.* ἢ πρότερον *Hermann*: πρῶτον . . *Ald.* 12 ἄρχοντες *seclus. Hermann* 14 ἐνεχυριαζομένου *edd.*: ἐνεχειριαζομένους *Ald.*

On Procedures of the State [*On Legislation at Athens* 98–9]

96A Pollux, *Nomenclature* 8.51–3 (*LG* 9.2.120.22–121.10 Bethe)

- 51 Impeachment (*eisangelia*) is prescribed against uncoded crimes against the state. According to the impeachment law*** —for they speak in both ways—which is laid down *** concerning which there are no laws, but (if) someone is caught committing a crime, either a magistrate or an orator, an impeachment against him is presented to the council, and if he seems to be committing a moderate crime, the council imposes the fine, but if a
52 greater (injustice), they turn the case over to a law court; (it imposes) the penalty which he must suffer or pay.

Impeachments were brought against those orators who were (accused of) overthrowing the democracy, or not saying what was best for the democracy, or going on a mission to the enemy without having been sent, or betraying a fort or army or ships, as Theophrastus (says) in the first book of *On Laws*.

- 53 Hyperides in his speech *For Lycophron* says that an accuser who was unsuccessful in an impeachment was not fined. Theophrastus, however, says that those who lodge other indictments are fined one thousand (drachmas) if they do not win one fifth of the votes, and in addition are disenfranchised, while those who lay an impeachment are not disenfranchised but are fined the(se) one thousand (drachmas). It is likely that this was a later addition owing to the ease with which people brought impeachments.

Demosthenes in the speech *Against Medon* says that impeachments were brought also against those who do not live with an heiress in the appropriate way.¹

One thousand judged the impeachments according to Solon;

ἔκρινον, κατὰ δὲ τὸν Φαληρέα καὶ πρὸς πεντακόσιοι.

1–26 *Thphr. no. 636A FHS&G* 1–21 *cf. Harp. ε 7 = Suda ει 222 = Lex. Sabb. 54.17–55.2* 1–4 *cf. Suda ει 220 = AB 1.244.14–17 = An. Bachm. 1.210.4–8; et v. ad 96B.18–19* 9–12 *cf. legem ap. Hyper. 3.7–8* 10 μὴ—λεγόντων] *Hyper. 3.4* 13 περὶ Νόμων] *Thphr. no. 589.17c FHS&G* 14–21 *cf. Harp. ε 7 = Suda ει 222 = Lex. Sabb. 54.21–4* 15 *Hyper. 3.12* 22 *Dem. F 7 Baiter & Sauppe* 25–6 228 *F 12b FGrH* 25 Σόλωνα] *Arist. Ath. 8.4* *de 96A–B v. M. Stein, ZPE 120 (1998) 19–22*

1–26 *desunt in AB* 2 et 3 *lacunam statuit Bethe* 3 ὅς κεῖται] οἱ (ὥς →

96B *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense* s.v. εἰσαγγελία (14.4–19 Houtsma)

141b W

εἰσαγγελία, κατὰ καινῶν καὶ ἀγράφων ἀδικημάτων. αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ Καικιλίου δόξα. Θεόφραστος δὲ ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ περὶ νόμων φησὶ γενέσθαι, ἐάν τις καταλύῃ τὸν δῆμον ῥήτωρ ἢ μὴ τὰ ἄριστα συμβουλεύῃ χρήματα λαμβάνων, ἢ ἐάν τις προδιδῷ χωρίον ἢ ναῦς ἢ πεζὴν στρατιάν, ἢ ἐάν τις εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους ἀφικνῆται ἢ ἴνικοίη παρ' αὐτοῖς ἢ στρατεύηται μετ' αὐτῶν ἢ δῶρα λαμβάνῃ. 5

συνομολογεῖ δὲ τοῖς ὑπὸ Θεοφράστου ἢ κατὰ Θεμιστοκλέους εἰσαγγελία, ἣν εἰσήγγειλε κατὰ Κρατερόν Λεωβώτης Ἀλκμαίωνος Ἀγρυλῆθεν. ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν ῥητόρων εἰώθεσαν καλεῖν καὶ τὰ μὴ μεγάλα ἀδικήματα εἰσαγγελίαν. 10

ἔστι δ' ὅτε ἐμβάλλοντες τοὺς συκοφαντούμενους εἰσήγγελλον, ὥς μὲν Φιλόχορος, χιλίων καθεζομένων, ὥς δὲ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς, χιλίων πεντακοσίων. Καικίλιος δὲ οὕτως ὠρίσατο· εἰσαγγελία ἐστὶν ὁ περὶ καινῶν ἀδικημάτων δεδώκασιν ἀπενεγκεῖν οἱ νόμοι. ἔστι δὲ τὸ μελετώμενον ἐν ταῖς τῶν σοφιστῶν διατριβαῖς. 15

1–18 = *Caec. Cal. F 155 Ofenloch p. 158 = Thphr. no. 636B FHS&G* 1–15 *Philoch. 328 F 199 FGrH* 1–12 *Crater. 342 F 11a FGrH* 2–15 228 *F 12a FGrH* 8–10 *cf. Plu. Them. 23.1* 17–18 *cf. schol. Pl. R. 565C = Suda ει 221 = AB 1.244.18–23 = An. Bachm. 1.210.8–13 = Lex. Sabb. 54.12–16*

1 καινῶν *Dobree*: κοινῶν *cod.* 2 Καικιλίου *Dobree*: Κικίνου *cod.* 5 προδιδῷ *Meier*: προδιδούς *cod.* 6 πολεμίους ἀφικνῆται *Meier*: →

an additional five hundred according to (Demetrius) of Phalerum.²

¹ I.e., by having sexual intercourse with her three times a month.

² The Greek is ambivalent: if it is compared to 52.2, a temporal interpretation of *kata* in the sense of “in the time of” imposes itself; but generally it is compared to 96B.15–16 and interpreted in the sense of “according to”; cp. Jacoby *FGrH* II b 649 on 228 F 12 and III b Suppl. I 565 on Philoch. 328 F 199.

add. F) λέγει *FS* 13 πρώτῳ *deest in FS* 14 ἀζήμιος ἦν] ἄτιμος οὐκ ἦν *L* 23 προσηκόντως *Meier: προσηκόντων FSL* 24 λέγει] ἔκρινεν *L*

96B *Cambridge Rhetorical Lexicon* under *impeachment* (14.4–19 Houtsma)

Impeachment (*eisangelia*), against new and uncodified crimes. This at any rate is the opinion of Caecilius. But Theophrastus in the fourth book of *On Laws* says that it occurs if an orator subverts the democracy or accepts money for not offering the best counsel, or if someone betrays a position or ships or a land army, or if someone goes over to the enemy or †is victor† on their side,¹ or serves with them, or accepts gifts.

The impeachment against Themistocles, which, according to Craterus, Leobotes the son of Alcmaeon from Agryle brought, agrees with the (statements) of Theophrastus. But some of the orators were accustomed to call even crimes that were not great (grounds for) impeachment.

It also occurred when those attacking sycophants brought an impeachment, when, as Philochorus (says), there were one thousand (jurors) seated, but Demetrius of Phalerum (says) there were fifteen hundred. Caecilius, however, defines it this way, “An impeachment is what the laws allow to be brought in the case of new crimes.” It is the subject of exercises in the diatribes of the sophists.

¹ The text appears to be corrupt; with Dobree’s conjecture the text would read: “lives in their midst”; with Lugebil’s: “takes up residence in their midst.”

πολέμους ἀφικνεῖται *cod.* νικοίη *cod.: οἰκοίη Dobree: μετοικῇ Lugebil* 9
 *–Κρατερὸν *Cobet, Var. Lect. 1854, 369: εἴτε Θεμιστοκλέα εἰσαγγέ (super γ
 alterum λ scripto) ἢ εἰσήγγειλε Κρατερὸς cod.* 13 συκοφαντούμενους]
 συκοφαντοῦντας *Wehrli* 14 Φιλόχορος *Dobree: Φιλόχανος cod.* 15–16
 Καικίλιος *Dobree: Κακεῖ δὲ cod.* 18 σοφιστῶν *Dobree: σοφῶν cod.*

97 *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense* s.v. μὴ οὔσα δίκη (21.4–19 Houtsma)

144 W μὴ οὔσα δίκη· Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐνίους λέγει τῶν κρινομένων κακοτεχνεῖν τοῖς διώκουσιν ἀντιλαγχάνοντας τὴν μὴ οὔσαν· δεῖ γὰρ τοὺς ὑπὲρ δέκα δραχμῶν ἀμφιβητοῦντας †διαιτητεῖς δέκα ἔτη† λαμβάνειν· διὸ καὶ ἔκειτο νόμος μὴ εἰσάγεσθαι δίκην, εἰ μὴ 5 πρότερον ἐξετασθεῖη παρ' αὐτοῖς τὸ πρᾶγμα· ἐνίους δὲ ἀσθενὲς τὸ δίκαιον ἔχοντας καὶ δεδοικότας τὴν καταδίαιταν χρόνους ἐμβάλλειν καὶ σκήψεις οἷας δοκεῖν εἶναι εὐλόγους, καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον παραγράφεσθαι, εἴτα ὑπόμνυσθαι νόσον ἢ ἀποδημίαν, καὶ τελευτῶντας ἐπὶ τὴν κυρίαν τῆς διαίτης ἡμέραν οὐκ ἀπαντῶντας, ὅπως δύνωνται ἀντιλαγχάνειν τὴν μὴ οὔσαν τῷ ἐλόντι, ὥστε ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἀκέραιον αὐτοῖς καθίστασθαι τὸν ἀγῶνα.

κατ' ἐνίους δὲ ἡ ἀντίληξις ἐστὶν ὅτῳ ἀντιλαχεῖν 15 ἐξῆν· καὶ μετέγραψαν ἢ ὅλως ἐκ τῶν λόγων αὐτὴν ἀνεῖλον· τούτου δὲ αἴτιον ἡ τοῦ ἔθους ἔκλειψις, ἀνήρηται γὰρ μετὰ τῶν διαιτητῶν ἡ ἀντίληξις. ἐξῆν δ' ἀντιλαγχάνειν ἐντὸς ἡμερῶν δέκα.

1–15 228 F 13 FGrH; cf. Phot. I.229.24–230.2 Porson; AB I.278.29–33 3–4 ὑπὲρ δέκα δραχμῶν] cf. Poll. 8.100 4 διαιτητὰς] cf. Harp. δ 52 = Suda δ 888 = Lex. Vind. no. 8; Hsch. δ 1032; Suda δ 887; AB I.235.20–5; Lex. Sabb. 48.25–49.3 19 ἐντὸς ἡμερῶν δέκα] cf. Poll. 8.61

2–3 ἀντιλαγχάνοντας Dobree: ἀντιλαγχάνουσι cod. 4–5 διαιτητεῖς—λαμβάνειν cod.: διαιτητὰς εἰς δίκην ἐκάστην λαμβάνειν Müller FHG II 364: διαιτητὰς δικαστὰς λαμβάνειν Wehrli 8 σκήψεις Dobree: σκέψεις cod. 10 εἴτα Dobree: τὸ cod. 11 τῆς Dobree: αὐτῆς cod. 9 ὅπως δύνωνται Houtsma: ὅπη →

98 Harpocration, *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos* s.v. παράστασις (no. 31, 206.23–207.7 Keaney)

143 W παράστασις· Ἰσαῖος ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ Πύρρου κλήρου. τοῦνομα παρὰ πολλοῖς ἐστὶν Ἀττικοῖς. ἔστι δὲ δραχμὴ καταβαλλομένη ὑπὸ τῶν δικαζομένων τὰς ἰδίας δίκας. Μένανδρος Μισογύνη·

97 *Cambridge Rhetorical Lexicon* under *there not being a law suit* (21.4–19 Houtsma)

There not being a law suit (*mê ousa dikê*): Demetrius of Phalerum says that some defendants in cases of arbitration use fraudulent means against the plaintiffs by moving to get the judgment by default declared null and void and thus obtain a rehearing of the case. For those involved in litigations of more than ten drachmas are obliged to get arbitrators †ten years†.¹ For that very reason a law was passed that a case is not to be admitted into court unless it was previously examined in their (the arbitrators') court. Some people who have a weak case to defend and are afraid the arbitration will go against them, cause delays and make such excuses as seem to be reasonable; first they take exception to the admissibility of the case, next they swear affidavits about (their) illness or absence abroad, and finally on the day appointed for the arbitration they do not appear in court. In this way they can get the judgment by default declared null and void for the party who had got the conviction and thus obtain a rehearing of the case, so as to be back at their starting point with the litigation undecided.

According to some people the term *antilêxis* ("moving for a rehearing") applies to anyone for whom it was possible to obtain a rehearing of the case; and they (the orators) altered (the term) or removed it entirely from their speeches. The reason for this is the disappearance of the practice; for—together with the arbitrators—moving for a rehearing of the case has been abandoned. It was possible to move for a rehearing of the case within ten days.

¹ The text is corrupt. Müller's emendation would give "for each separate case"; Wehrli's "as judges."

δύνοντας *cod.* 13 ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς *Dobree*: ἐξ' ὑπ' ἀρχῶν *cod.* 15 ἡ ἀντίληξις ἐστὶν ὅτι *Houtsma*: ἡ ἀντίληξις οὕτως *cod.*

98 Harpocration, *Lexicon on the Ten Attic Orators* under *plaintiff's deposit* (no. 31, 206.23–207.7 Keaney)

Plaintiff's deposit (*parastasis*): Isaeus in his speech *On the Estate of Pyrrhus*. The word occurs in many Attic (orators). It is a drachma paid by the plaintiffs in private law suits. Menander in *The Woman-Hater*:

ἔλκει δὲ γραμματείδιον 5
ἐκεῖσε δίθυρον καὶ παράστασις, μία
δραχμή.

Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ περὶ τῶν
θεσμοθετῶν λέγων φησὶν οὕτως· “εἰσὶ δὲ γραφαὶ πρὸς
αὐτούς, ὧν παράστασις τίθεται, ξενίας καὶ δωροξενίας, 10
ἅν τις δῶρα δοὺς ἀποφύγῃ τὴν ξενίαν, καὶ ψευδεγ-
γραφῆς καὶ ψευδοκλητίας καὶ βουλεύσεως καὶ
ἀγραφίου καὶ μοιχείας.”

Δημήτριος δὲ ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τοῖς Περὶ νομοθεσίας
τοὺς διαιτητάς φησι λαμβάνειν τὰς δραχμὰς μίαν μὲν 15
ἀπὸ τῆς λήξεως, ἣν παράστασιν ἐκάλουν, ἑτέραν δὲ καθ’
ὑπωμοσίαν ἐκάστην.

1–17 = *Phot. s.v. παράστασις* (2.336.15–27 *Porson*) = *Suda s.v. παράστασις* (no. 443, *LG* 1.4.41.29–42.6 *Adler*) = *Lex. Rhet. Cant.* (67.9–20 *Houtsma*) = 228 *F* 7 *FGrH* 1 *Isaeus* 3.47 2–3 *cf. AB* 1.290.19–22 4–7 *Men. F* 278 *Koerte* 8–13 *Arist. Ath.* 59.3 15 *διαιτητάς*] *cf. ad* 97.4

[*DE = epitome*] 11 *Arist.* καὶ συκοφαντίας καὶ δώρων *post* ξενίαν *habet* 12 ἀγραφίου *Harp. plenus et D, Arist.: ...φίου E, Phot.: γραφίου Suda* 15 λαμβάνειν *Phot., Suda F: λα(β)εῖν Suda^{pc}: λαχεῖν Suda^G* 17 ὑπωμοσίου *Phot., Suda*

99 *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense s.v. κυρία ἐκκλησία*
(19.19–20.9 *Houtsma*)

140 W κυρία [ἡ] ἐκκλησία. Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῷ
δευτέρῳ Περὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων νομοθεσίας
πλεῖστα ἐχρημάτιζεν ἢ μέγιστα τῶν κοινῶν· ἴαλλ’ ἐνῆν
τὸν δεδεμένον† φησὶν· εἰκότως δ’ ἅν τις αὐτῷ ἐπιτι-
μήσειεν· εἰ γὰρ ἅν ποτε κυρίας ἐκκλησίας τοὺς 5
Ἀθηναίους νομίσαι ἐν ἐμίσθουν
ἄμεινον οὖν Ἀριστοτέλης· τὰς γὰρ ἀρχὰς ἐν ταῖς
κυρίαις ἐκκλησίαις ἔφησε χειροτονεῖσθαι, καὶ τὰς
εἰσαγγελίας, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῶν ἀναγκαίων χρηματίζειν,
καὶ περὶ σίτου, φυλακῆς τῆς χώρας, καὶ τὰς ἀπογραφὰς 10
τῶν δημευομένων ἀναγιγνώσκειν, καὶ τὰς λήξεις τῶν
κλήρων· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἑκτῆς πρυτανείας πρὸς τοῖς εἰρη-

“In that direction (into court) a small tablet with two leaves (a diptych) drags (you) and a plaintiff’s deposit (of) one drachma.”

In *The Athenian Constitution*, Aristotle in speaking about the (board of) legislators says: “Under their jurisdiction fall indictments on which a plaintiff’s deposit is paid: for being a foreigner; for bribery by a foreigner, (i.e.) when someone is acquitted through bribery on a charge of being a foreigner; for falsely registering someone as a debtor; for falsely appearing as witness to a judicial summons; for failure to delete a discharged debtor; for failure to register a debtor; for adultery.”

According to Demetrius of Phalerum in his (books) *On Legislation*, the arbitrators received the drachmas, one from the (deposit paid by the plaintiff while filing a) claim, which they called *parastasis*; the other with each application for delaying proceedings.

99 *Cambridge Rhetorical Lexicon* under *regular assembly* (19.19–20.9 Houtsma)

Regular Assembly (*kyria ekklesia*). Demetrius of Phalerum in the second (book of) *On the Legislation of the Athenians* ... (the regular assembly) transacted most or the most important of public business. †On the other hand/it was possible/the person put in prison† he says. One might reasonably criticize him. For if he would think the Athenians (would) ever (have had) regular assemblies in (which) ... they farmed out ...¹ Now, Aristotle (is) better: for he has said that in the regular assemblies a vote was taken by show of hands on (the conduct of those holding) the public offices, and that it (the regular assembly) transacted the impeachments, and the remainder of the necessary business, and about the corn supply, the defense of the country, and that it had the lists of confiscated properties read aloud (to it), and the claims to inheritances.² In the sixth prytany in addition to the agenda al-

μένοις καὶ περὶ τῆς ὀστρακοφορίας ἐπιχειροτονίαν
δίδοσθαι, εἰ δοκεῖ ἢ μή.

1–14 228 F 4 FGrH 7–14 Arist. Ath. 43.4–5; cf. Harp. κ 100;
praeterea cf. Poll. 8.95; Hsch. κ 4671; Phot. 1.165.1–4 Porson; Suda
κ 2760; AB 1.274. 19–20

1 ἢ *del. Meier* 2 *post νομοθεσίας XV fere literarum spatium, 6 post*
ἐν et 6 post ἐμίσθουν X fere literarum spatium in codice esse testatur
Dobree; cf. quae supplevit Müller FHG II 116 4 τὸν δεδεμένον] τῶν
δεδημευμένων *Dobree* 5 εἰ γὰρ] τί γὰρ *Meier*: τίς γὰρ *Müller* 7 →

De civitate [Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας 100]

100 Harpocraton, *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos* s.v.
Ἑρκειος Ζεύς (no. 134, 112.3–8 Keaney)

139 W

Ἑρκειος Ζεύς· Δείναρχος ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Μοσχίωνος· “εἰ
φράτορες αὐτῷ καὶ βωμοὶ Διὸς ἑρκείου καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος
πατρώου εἰσὶν.” ἑρκειος Ζεύς, ὃ βωμὸς ἐντὸς ἑρκους ἐν
τῇ αὐλῇ ἱδρύται· τὸν γὰρ περίβολον ἑρκος ἔλεγον. ὅτι δὲ
τούτοις μετῆν τῆς πολιτείας οἷς εἶη Ζεὺς ἑρκειος, 5
δεδήλωκε καὶ Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ Ὑπὲρ δημοποιήτου, εἰ
γνήσιος, καὶ Δημήτριος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι
νομοθεσίας.

1–8 228 F 6 FGrH = Din. F 32.2 Conomis 3–5 ἑρκειος—ἑρκειος =
Phot. 1.14.18–20 Porson = Suda ε 3015 3–4 ἑρκειος—ἔλεγον] = EM
375.23–4 6 Hyper. F 94 Jensen →

De alienis [Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας 101]

101 Harpocraton, *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos* s.v. σκαφη-
φόροι (no. 21, 236.15–21 Keaney)

146 W

σκαφηφόροι· Δείναρχος ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Ἀγησικλέους
φησὶν· “οἱ ἀντὶ σκαφηφόρων ἔφηβοι εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν
ἀναβήσονται, οὐχ ὑμῖν ἔχοντες χάριν τῆς πολιτείας,
ἀλλὰ τῷ τούτου ἀργυρίῳ,” ἀντὶ τοῦ μέτοικοι· οὗτοι γὰρ
ἑσκαφηφόρουν Ἀθήνησι. Δημήτριος γοῦν ἐν γ’ Νομο- 5
θεσίας φησὶν ὅτι προσέταττεν ὁ νόμος τοῖς μετοίκους ἐν

ready mentioned, a vote of confirmation was also taken concerning the ostracism on whether or not to proceed (with it).

¹ The text is desperately corrupt.

² The text as it stands is a confused excerpt of Aristotle; see there and Harpocration s.v.

Ἀριστοτέλης *Nauck*: Ἀριστοτέλει *cod.* 9 τὰ ἄλλα *Meier*: τὰς ἄλλας *cod.* 11 λήξεις *Dobree ex Arist. et Poll.*: δείξεις *cod.* 13 ἐπιχειροτονίαν *cod.*, *Arist.*: προχειροτονίαν *Meier e glossa* ὁστρακισμοῦ τρόπος *Lex. Rhet. Cant.*

On Citizenship [*On Legislation at Athens* 100]

- 100** Harpocration, *Lexicon on the Ten Attic Orators* under *Zeus of the Enclosure* (no. 134, 112.3–8 Keaney)

Zeus of the Enclosure (*Herkeios Zeus*): Dinarchus in his speech *Against Moschion*: “If he has clansmen and altars of Zeus of the Enclosure and of Apollo of the (Fore) Fathers.” Zeus of the Enclosure (is the one), for whom an altar is set up within an enclosure in the court—for they called an enclosure a *herkos*. Citizen-rights were enjoyed by those who possessed (an altar of) Zeus of the Enclosure, as is made plain both by Hyperides in his speech *In Defence of the Naturalized*, if (it is) genuine, and by Demetrius in his (books) *On the Legislation of the Athenians*.

[*DE* = epitome] 3 βωμός *Qgx*: βωμοί *cett. et DE, Phot., Suda* 4 αὐλῇ *DE, Phot., Suda*: βουλῇ *Harp. plenus* ἢ ἱδρυται *ABG*: ἱδρυνται *cett. et DE, Phot., Suda*

On Foreigners [*On Legislation at Athens* 101]

- 101** Harpocration, *Lexicon on the Ten Attic Orators* under *bowl-carriers* (no. 21, 236.15–21 Keaney)

bowl-carriers (*skaphephoroi*): Dinarchus in the speech *Against Agasicles* says: “the ephebes acting as bowl-carriers will go up to the Acropolis, not in gratefulness to you for their civil rights, but to this man’s (silver) money,” (using “bowl-carriers”) instead of “resident aliens.” For these people used to act as bowl-carriers at Athens. Demetrius at least says in Book 3 of *Legislation*, that the

ταῖς πομπαῖς αὐτοὺς μὲν σκάφας φέρειν, τὰς δὲ
θυγατέρας αὐτῶν ὑδρεῖα καὶ σκιάδεια. διείλεκται περὶ
τούτων καὶ Θεόφραστος ἐν ἰ' Νόμων.

1–9 = *Phot. s.v. σκαφηφόροι* (2.446.17–24 *Porson*) = *Suda s.v. σκαφη-
φόροι* (no. 544, *LG* 1.4.373.21–6 *Adler*) = 228 F 5 *FGrH* = *Din. F XVI*
5 *Conomis* = *Thphr. no. 653 FHS&G*; cf. *AB* 1.304.27–9

2 οἱ *Phot., Suda*: οἱ *Harp. (Dind.)*, *Din.* 4 τούτου *et* ἀντὶ τοῦ μέτοιχοι
om. Harp. plenus, Phot., Suda

De singulis philosophis et principibus rei publicae

Socrates vel Socratis defensio [Σωκράτης ἢ Σωκράτους
ἀπολογία 102, 104, 106–8]

102 Plutarchus, *Aristides* 1.1–4; 6; 7; 8–9 (BT 1.1.249.1–20;
250.9–11; 250.19–20; 250.23–251.3 Ziegler)

- 95 W 1 Ἀριστείδης ὁ Λυσιμάχου φυλῆς μὲν ἦν Ἀντιοχίδος,
τῶν δὲ δήμων Ἀλωπεκῆθεν. περὶ δ' οὐσίας αὐτοῦ λόγοι
διάφοροι γέγονασιν, ὁ μὲν ὥς ἐν πενία συντόνῳ
καταβιώσαντος καὶ μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν ἀπολιπόντος
θυγατέρας δύο πολὺν χρόνον ἀνεκδότους δι' ἀπορίαν 5
2 γενομένας· πρὸς δὲ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὑπὸ πολλῶν
εἰρημένον ἀντιτασσόμενος ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἐν τῷ
Σωκράτει χωρίον τε Φαληροῖ φησι γινώσκειν Ἀριστεί-
δου γενόμενον ἐν ᾧ τέθραπται, καὶ τεκμήρια τῆς περὶ τὸν
οἶκον εὐπορίας ἐν μὲν ἡγεῖται τὴν ἐπώνυμον ἀρχήν, ἣν 10
ἦρξε τῷ κυάμῳ λαχὼν ἐκ τῶν γενῶν τῶν τὰ μέγιστα
τιμήματα κεκτημένων, οὓς πεντακοσιομεδίμνους προσ-
ηγόρευον, ἕτερον δὲ τὸν ἐξοστρακισμόν· οὐδενὶ γὰρ τῶν
πενήτων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐξ οἴκων τε μεγάλων καὶ διὰ γένους
3 ὄγκον ἐπιφθόνοις ὄστρακον ἐπιφέρεσθαι· τρίτον δὲ καὶ 15
τελευταῖον, ὅτι νίκης ἀναθήματα χορηγικοὺς τρίποδας
ἐν Διονύσου καταλέλοιπεν, οἱ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐδείκνυντο,
τοιαύτην ἐπιγραφὴν διασώζοντες “Ἀντιοχὶς ἐνίκα,
4 Ἀριστείδης ἐχορήγει, Ἀρχέστρατος ἐδίδασκε.” τουτὶ
μὲν οὖν καίπερ εἶναι δοκοῦν μέγιστον, ἀσθενέστατόν 20
6 ἐστὶ ... Παναίτιος μέντοι περὶ τοῦ τρίποδος ἀποφαίνει
τὸν Δημήτριον ὁμωνυμία διεψευσμένον· ... τὰ μὲν οὖν

law directed the resident aliens to carry bowls themselves in the processions, and their daughters water jars and parasols.” Theophrastus too has a discussion of them in Book 10 of *Laws*.

On individual Philosophers and Leaders of the State

Socrates or Apology of Socrates [*Socrates* or *Apology of Socrates* 102, 104, 106–8]

102 Plutarch, *Aristides* 1.1–4; 6; 7; 8–9 (*BT* 1.1.249.1–20; 250.9–11; 250.19–20; 250.23–251.3 Ziegler)

- 1 Aristides, the son of Lysimachus, belonged to the tribe of Antiochis and to the deme Alopece. Of his property there are diverse accounts. One is that he lived under the constraint of poverty all his life and at his death left two daughters who for a long
- 2 time remained unmarried owing to their lack of means. This story, which is told by many, is countered by Demetrius of Phalerum in his *Socrates*. He says that he knows the land in Phalerum which belonged to Aristides, and where he is buried. He takes as proofs of the affluence of (Aristides’) house (the following). First, there is the office of eponymous archon, which is obtained by lot among the families with the highest property tax assessments, those called ‘five-hundred-corn-measurers.’ Second, there is the ostracism.¹ For it is not the poor who are subjected to ostracism but those from great houses, who incur envy owing to the prestige
- 3 of their family. Third and last, he has left in the temple of Dionysus tripods, dedicated in recognition of a prize-winning chorus production. These, which were still shown in our own time, preserve the following inscription: “the (tribe) of Antiochis won; Aristides was the sponsor; Archestratus was the producer.”
- 4 Now, although this last argument appears to be very strong, it is in
- 6 fact quite weak. ...² As for the tripod, Panaetius, on the other hand, argues that Demetrius was misled by homonymy. ...³ The

- 7 τοῦ Παναιτίου βέλτιον ἐπισκεπτέον ὅπως ἔχει. τῷ δ'
 8 ὀστράκῳ ... καὶ μὴν ἄρξαι γε τὸν Ἀριστείδην ὁ
 Ἰδομενεὺς οὐ κυαμευτόν, ἀλλ' ἐλομένων Ἀθηναίων 25
 φησίν. εἰ δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς μάχην ἦρξεν, ὥς
 αὐτὸς ὁ Δημήτριος γέγραφε, καὶ πάνυ πιθανόν ἐστίν ἐπὶ
 δόξῃ τοσαύτῃ καὶ κατορθώμασι τηλικούτοις ἀξιωθῆναι
 δι' ἀρετὴν (ἀρχῆς) ἥς διὰ πλοῦτον ἐτύγχανον οἱ
 9 λαγχάνοντες. ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν Δημήτριος οὐ μόνον 30
 Ἀριστείδην, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σωκράτη δηλὸς ἐστὶ τῆς πενίας
 ἐξελέσθαι φιλοτιμούμενος ὥς μεγάλου κακοῦ· καὶ γὰρ
 ἐκείνῳ φησίν οὐ μόνον τὴν οἰκίαν ὑπάρχειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ
 μνᾶς ἐβδομήκοντα τοκιζομένας ὑπὸ Κρίτωνος.

2–34 228 F 43 FGrH = *Socrates I B 53 SSR I 37–8 Giannantoni* 5
 θυγατέρας] cf. 104 10–13 *Arist. Ath. 8.1* 18–19 *IG II² 3027 sub*
finem saec. V aCn 21–3 *Panaetius F 131 van Straaten = T 153*
Alesse 24–6 *Idomeneus 338 F 5 FGrH* 26–7 cf. 103 31–4 cf. *Pl.*
Ap. 23B9–C1

3 ὁ μὲν *Westermann*: οἱ μὲν *codd.* 9 γενόμενον] λεγόμενον *S* 11
 ἦρξε τῷ] ἦρχε τῷ *C*: ἦρχεν ὁ τῷ *Sintenis* 15 ἐπιφθόνους *Blass*:
 ἐπιφθόνων *codd.* 16 χορηγικῆς *Madvig* 17 καταλέλοιπεν]
 κατέλιπεν *Y* 29 ἀρχῆς *add. Reiske*

103 Plutarchus, *Aristides* 5.9–10 (BT 1.1. 256.16–23 Ziegler)

- 97 W 9 Ἀριστείδης δὲ τὴν ἐπώνυμον εὐθὺς ἀρχὴν ἦρξε.
 151 W καίτοι φησὶν ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἄρξαι τὸν ἄνδρα
 μικρὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θανάτου μετὰ τὴν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς
 10 μάχην. ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς μετὰ μὲν Ξανθιππίδην, ἐφ'
 οὗ Μαρδόνιος ἠττήθη Πλαταιᾶσιν, οὐδ' ὁμώνυμον 5
 Ἀριστείδην ἐν πάνυ πολλοῖς λαβεῖν ἔστι, μετὰ δὲ
 Φαίνιππον, ἐφ' οὗ τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην ἐνίκων,
 εὐθὺς Ἀριστείδης ἀρχὼν ἀναγράφεται.

1–8 228 F 44 FGrH 2 καίτοι—Δημήτριος] cf. 102.26–7

7 cogency of Panaetius' argument needs further looking into. As for
8 the ostracism, ...⁴ As for the fact, finally, that Aristides did hold
the office of eponymous archon, according to Idomeneus⁵ he did
not obtain it by lot, but was elected by the Athenians. And if, as
Demetrius himself has written, he was archon after the battle at
Plataea, it is quite plausible that with such a reputation and with
successes of such importance to his name he was considered wor-
thy, owing to excellence, of an office that people usually got
9 owing to wealth by drawing lots. Clearly, however, Demetrius is
eagerly striving to exonerate not only Aristides but Socrates too
from poverty as from a great evil: he says that Socrates too not
only owned the house (he lived in) but also seventy minas, which
were put out at interest by Crito.

¹ Aristides was ostracized in 482 B.C.; cp. Aristotle *Ath.* 22.7.

² Plutarch mentions Epaminondas and Plato as instances of men who ac-
cepted financial support in order to enter a choregic competition.

³ Panaetius argues that from the Persian Wars to the end of the Peloponnesian
War there are only two men named Aristides (*PA* 1686, 1687) who were regis-
tered as victors in a choregic competition, neither of them the son of a
Lysimachus. The tripod belongs to one of them, who lived much later.

⁴ Plutarch argues that one did not need to be rich to be ostracized and cites
an instance.

⁵ This is not Idomeneus the Epicurean but a namesake of his, as is demon-
strated by A. Angeli, 'L'opera *Sui demagoghi in Atene* di Idomeneo,' *Vichiana*
10 (1981) 5–16.

103 Plutarch, *Aristides* 5.9–10 (*BT* 1.1.256.16–23 Ziegler)

9 Aristides straightway¹ held the office of eponymous archon.
However, Demetrius of Phalerum says that the man (Aristides)
10 was archon after the battle at Plataea, shortly before his death. In
the public records, however, after Xanthippides, in whose
archonship Mardonius was defeated at Plataea, among a very
large number not even a namesake of Aristides is to be found, but
an Aristides is listed as archon immediately after Phaenippus, dur-
ing whose archonship (the Athenians) won the battle at Mara-
thon.²

¹ I.e., after the battle of Marathon in 490/89 B.C.

² Xanthippides was archon in 479/8; Phaenippus in 490/89; Aristides in
489/8 B.C.

104 Plutarchus, *Aristides* 27.3–5 (BT 1.1. 286.12–287.3 Ziegler)

- 96 W 3 ἔτι δὲ Λυσιμάχου θυγατέρα Πολυκρίτην ἀπολι-
πόντος, ὡς Καλλισθένης φησί, καὶ ταύτη σίτησιν ὅσην
τοῖς Ὀλυμπιονίκαις ὁ δῆμος ἐψηφίσατο. Δημήτριος δ' ὁ
Φαληρεὺς καὶ Ἱερώνυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος καὶ Ἀριστόξενος ὁ
μουσικὸς καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης —εἰ δὴ τό γε περὶ εὐγενείας 5
βιβλίον ἐν τοῖς γνησίοις Ἀριστοτέλους θετέον—
ἱστοροῦσι Μυρτῶ θυγατριδῆν Ἀριστείδου Σωκράτει τῷ
σοφῷ συνοικῆσαι, γυναῖκα μὲν ἑτέραν ἔχοντι, ταύτην δ'
ἀναλαμβάνοντι, χηρεύουσιν διὰ πενίαν καὶ τῶν ἀναγ-
καίων ἐνδεομένην. πρὸς μὲν οὖν τούτους ἱκανῶς ὁ 10
Παναίτιος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Σωκράτους ἀντεῖρηκεν· ὁ δὲ
Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῷ Σωκράτει φησὶ μνημονεύειν Ἀρι-
στείδου θυγατρίδου ἐὺ μάλα πένητα Λυσίμαχον, ὃς
ἑαυτὸν μὲν ἐκ πινακίου τινὸς ὀνειροκριτικοῦ παρὰ τὸ
5 Ἰακχεῖον λεγόμενον καθεζόμενος ἔβσκε, τῇ δὲ μητρὶ 15
καὶ τῇ ταύτης ἀδελφῇ ψήφισμα γράψας ἔπεισε τὸν
δῆμον τροφὴν διδόναι τριώβολον ἑκάστης ἡμέρας.
αὐτὸς μὲντοι φησὶν ὁ Δημήτριος νομοθετῶν ἀντὶ τριω-
βόλου δραχμὴν ἑκατέρᾳ τάξει τῶν γυναικῶν.

1–19 228 F 45a FGrH 1–15 Arist. F 71, 1 Gigon 1–3 Callisth. 124
F 48 FGrH; cf. 102.4–6 3–19 Socrates I B 54 SSR I 38
Giannantoni 3–11 Hieronym. F 43 Wehrli = Aristox. F 58 Wehrli
= Socrates I B 49 SSR I 36 Giannantoni = Panaetius F 132 van Straaten
= T 142 Alesse 3–10 Arist. F 3 Ross; cf. 105 →

105 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.2 555D–556B (BT 3.225.25–226.13 Kaibel)

- 94 W 556A ἐκ τούτων οὖν τις ὀρμώμενος μέμψαιτ' ἂν τοὺς
περιτιθέντας Σωκράτει δύο γαμετὰς γυναῖκας, Ξαν-
θήππην καὶ τὴν Ἀριστείδου Μυρτῶ, οὐ τοῦ δικαίου
καλουμένου (οἱ χρόνοι γὰρ οὐ συγχωροῦσιν) ἀλλὰ τοῦ
5 τρίτου ἀπ' ἐκείνου. εἰσὶ δὲ Καλλισθένης, Δημήτριος ὁ 5
Φαληρεὺς, Σάτυρος ὁ περιπατητικός, Ἀριστόξενος, οἷς
τὸ ἐνδόσιμον Ἀριστοτέλης ἔδωκεν ἱστορῶν τοῦτο ἐν τῷ
περὶ Εὐγενείας· εἰ μὴ ἄρα συγκεχωρημένον κατὰ
ψήφισμα τοῦτο ἐγένετο τότε διὰ σπάνιν ἀνθρώπων, ὥστ'
ἐξεῖναι καὶ δύο ἔχειν γυναῖκας τὸν βουλόμενον, ὅθεν 10

104 Plutarch, *Aristides* 27.3–5 (BT 1.1.286.12–287.3 Ziegler)

- 3 Furthermore, Lysimachus left a daughter, Polycrite, according to Callisthenes, and the people voted her a public maintenance of the same magnitude as that given to the victors at the Olympic Games. Demetrius of Phalerum, Hieronymus of Rhodes, the musicologist Aristoxenus and Aristotle—if indeed the book *On Being Well-Born* is to be placed among Aristotle’s genuine writings—report that Aristides’ granddaughter Myrto lived together with the sage Socrates, who had another woman but took up this one as she remained a widow due to her poverty and
- 4 lacked the necessities of life. These authors are adequately answered by Panaetius in his (chapters) on Socrates. And (Demetrius) of Phalerum in his *Socrates* says that he remembers a grandson of Aristides, (named) Lysimachus, as a very poor man. He earned a living from a kind of tablet for interpreting dreams,
- 5 while sitting next to what is called the Iaccheion, and he proposed to the assembly and carried a resolution allowing his mother and her sister three obols a day to feed themselves. Demetrius, however, says that he himself, when he was legislator, awarded each of the women a drachma instead of three obols.

5 εἰ δὴ τό γε S: εἰ δὴ τὸ Y: εἶγε δὴ τὸ Ziegler 15 λεγόμενον om. S 16–17 ἔπεισε τὸν δῆμον S: δωρεὰν ἔπεισε τὸν δῆμον Y 18–19 αὐτὸς—δραχμὴν] αὐτὸς μέντοι ὁ Δημήτριος νομοθετῶν ἐψηφίσατο δραχμὴν Y 18 (ἄν) ἀντὶ J. Labarbe, AC 64 (1995) 13–14

105 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.2 555D–556B (BT 3.225.25–226.13 Kaibel)

- Taking these facts as one’s point of departure,¹ one may criticize those who give Socrates two wedded wives, Xanthippe and Myrto the daughter of Aristides, not the one called the Just—the
- 556A times do not fit—, but the third after him.² Those who do so, are Callisthenes, Demetrius of Phalerum, Satyrus the Peripatetic, and Aristoxenus. Their statements all have their origin in Aristotle’s report to this effect in his *On Being Well-Born*. It is, however, possible that this came to be allowed by decree because of a dearth of population at the time, with the result that whoever so wished, could also have two wives—which would also explain why the

καὶ τοὺς τῆς κωμωδίας ποιητὰς ἀποσιωπῆσαι τοῦτο, πολλάκις τοῦ Σωκράτους μνημονεύοντας.

B παρέθετο δὲ περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν ψήφισμα Ἱερώνυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος, ὅπερ σοι διαπέμψομαι εὐπορήσας τοῦ βιβλίου. ἀντεῖπε δὲ τοῖς λέγουσι περὶ τῶν Σωκράτους 15 γυναικῶν Παναίτιος ὁ Ῥόδιος.

1–16 228 F 45b FGrH = Panaetius F 133 van Straaten = T 143 Alesse = Callisth. 124 F 43 FGrH = Arist. F 71,2 Gigon 1–15 Hieronym. F 44 Wehrli 1–8 Socrates I B 48 = 52 SSR I 37 Giannantoni = Aristox. F 57 Wehrli = Arist. F 3 Ross; cf. 104.3–10 et D.L. 2.26 (= Socrates I B 7a SSR I 22 Giannantoni), ubi Aristoteles, Satyrus et Hieronymus nominantur 6 Satyrus F 15 FHG III 163

13 <τὸ> περὶ Meineke

106 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.15 (OCT 2.443.24–7 Long)

92 W Δημήτριος δέ φησιν ἐν τοῖς Ὀμωνύμοις καὶ Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν ὑπερφρονῆσαι, δόξαν ἔχοντα παμπλείστην, καταφρονούμενόν τε ὑπὸ τῶν Ἐφεσίων μᾶλλον τὰ οἰκεῖα. μέμνηται αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ. 5

1–5 Heraclit. 22 A 1 DK I 142.24–7 1–4 Demetr. Magn. F 27 Mejer 4–5 228 F 40 FGrH

1 Δημήτριος *F^{Ppc}*: δημόκριτος *BP^{ac}*

107 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.57 (OCT 2.467.13–17 Long)

91 W Διογένης Ἀπολλοθέμιδος Ἀπολλωνιάτης, ἀνὴρ φυσικὸς καὶ ἄγαν ἐλλόγιμος. ἤκουσε δέ, φησὶν Ἀντισθένης, Ἀναξιμένους. ἦν δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις κατ' Ἀναξαγόραν. τοῦτόν φησιν ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ διὰ μέγαν φθόνον μικροῦ 5 κινδυνεῦσαι Ἀθήνησιν.

1–6 228 F 42 FGrH; Diog. Apoll. 64 A 1 DK II 51.38–52.2 = T 1 Laks 3 Antisth. 508 F 15 FGrH 4–6 τοῦτον—Ἀθήνησιν] = Eudociae Violarium 329 (238.15–17 Flach)

comic poets passed over this (Socrates' having two wives) in silence, though they often mention Socrates.

- B Hieronymus of Rhodes has cited as evidence a decree about the wives, which I will send on to you as soon as I have the book at my disposal.³ Panaetius of Rhodes has answered those who speak of Socrates' wives.

¹ Athenaeus has just told how their host Larensis has explained how in Athens Cecrops was the first to join one man to one woman.

² Aristides the Just died *ca.* 467, Socrates was born in 470/69. The Aristides meant must be his grandson (*PA* 1696). He was a pupil of Socrates.

³ Athenaeus is addressing Timocrates to whom he tells the story of the banquet.

- 106** Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 9.15 (*OCT* 2.443.24–7 Long)

Demetrius in his *Namesakes* says that he (Heraclitus) looked down even on the Athenians, although he was very highly esteemed (by them), and that although he was slighted by the Ephesians (he preferred) what was his own all the more. Demetrius of Phalerum too mentions him in his *Apology of Socrates*.

- 107** Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 9.57 (*OCT* 2.467.13–17 Long)

Diogenes of Apollonia, son of Apollothemis, (was) a highly respected natural philosopher. According to Antisthenes, he attended (the) lectures of Anaximenes. He lived at the time of Anaxagoras. In his *Apology of Socrates* Demetrius of Phalerum says that because of (incurring) great envy he came close to losing his life in Athens.¹

¹ Diels has this last statement refer to Anaxagoras, but see Wehrli p. 64 on F 91.

108 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.37 (OCT 2.456.6–7 Long)

93 W Δημήτριος δὲ ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογία
μηδὲ ἐλθεῖν φησιν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀθήνας.

1–2 228 F 41 FGrH = *Democr.* 68 A 1 DK II 82.14–16

109 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 2.44 (OCT 1.75.10–17 Long)

98/153 W ἐγεννήθη δέ, καθά φησιν Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν τοῖς
Χρονικοῖς, ἐπὶ Ἀφεσίωνος τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς ἑβδο-
μηκοστῆς ἑβδόμης Ὀλυμπιάδος, Θαρρηλιῶνος ἑκτη, ὅτε
καθαίρουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν
Δήλιοι γενέσθαι φασίν. ἐτελεύτησε δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει τῆς 5
ἐνενηκοστῆς πέμπτης Ὀλυμπιάδος, γεγονὼς ἑτῶν
ἑβδομήκοντα. ταῦτά φησι καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς.
ἔνιοι γὰρ ἐξήκοντα ἑτῶν τελευτῆσαι αὐτὸν φασιν.

1–8 228 F 10 FGrH = *Apollod.* 244 F 34 FGrH = *Socrates I D I SSR I*
221.269–75 *Giannantoni* 7 ἑβδομήκοντα] *Pl. Ap.* 17D2–3

De principibus et imperatoribus Atheniensium

110 Cicero, *De Officiis* 2.17.60 (OCT 95.22–96.4 Winterbottom)

137 W atque etiam illae impensae meliores, muri navalia portus
aquarum ductus omniaque quae ad usum rei publicae per-
tinent, quamquam quod praesens tamquam in manum datur
iucundius est, tamen haec in posterum gratiora. theatra,
porticus, nova templa verecundius rependo propter 5
Pompeium, sed doctissimi non probant, ut et hic ipse
Panaetius quem multum his libris secutus sum non
interpretatus, et Phalereus Demetrius, qui Periclem,
principem Graeciae, vituperat quod tantam pecuniam in
praeclara illa propylaea coniecero. sed de hoc genere toto 10
in iis libris, quos de re publica scripsi diligenter est

- 108** Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 9.37 (OCT 2.456.6–7 Long)

Demetrius of Phalerum in his *Apology of Socrates* says that he (Democritus) did not even come to Athens.¹

¹ Diogenes inserts this reference to Demetrius after quoting Demetrius of Magnesia (F 29 Mejer) and Thrasyllus (F 5 FHG III 504 = T 18a Tarrant) to the effect that Democritus had been in Athens and had talked to Socrates.

- 109** Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 2.44 (OCT 1.75.10–17 Long)

He (Socrates) was born, as Apollodorus says in his *Chronicles*, at the time of (the archonship of) Aphepsion in the fourth year of the seventy-seventh Olympiad on the sixth (day) of (the month) Thargelion, the day the Athenians purge the city and the Delians say that Artemis was born. He died in the first year of the ninety-fifth Olympiad at the age of seventy.¹ The same is said by Demetrius of Phalerum as well, but there are people who say that he (Socrates) died at sixty.

¹ Olympiad 77,4 = 469/8, the year that Aphepsion was archon; Olympiad 95,1 = 400/399 B.C.

On Leaders and Generals of the Athenians

- 110** Cicero, *On Duties* 2.17.60 (OCT 95.22–96.4 Winterbottom)

And furthermore, the following ways of spending money are even better: walls, dockyards, ports, water conduits, and anything that has to do with public utility; despite the fact that what is given here and now as it were in one's hands, gives more immediate pleasure, these things are more satisfying in the long run. Theatres, galleries, and new temples I hesitate to find fault with because of Pompey, but very learned men do not approve of them, for instance both Panaetius here himself, whom I have extensively followed in these books without translating him, and Demetrius of Phalerum who takes to task Pericles, the leader of Greece, for spending so much money on those famous Propylaea. However, this whole question has been thoroughly discussed in

disputatum.

4–12 228 F 8 FGrH 4–10 Panaetius F 122 van Straaten = T 17
Alesse 8–12 cf. 89.17–21 et 115; Plu. Per. 12 8 in iis libris] Rep.
4.7 (= Non. p. 24,15)

111 Scholium in Aristophanis *Vespas* 240a (SA 2.1.45.11–16
Koster)

1501 W ὥς τοῦ Κλέωνος εἰς δίκην ἐπαγαγόντος τὸν Λάχητα.
στρατηγῆσαι δὲ αὐτόν φησι Δημήτριος ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος
Εὐκλέους πρὸ τριῶν ἐτῶν εἰς Σικελίαν πεμφθέντα μετὰ
νεῶν Λεοντίνοις βοηθήσοντα· οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Φιλόχορον
διαδέξασθαι αὐτόν φασι Σοφοκλέα καὶ Πυθόδωρον, οὓς 5
καὶ φυγῇ ζημιωθῆναι. εἰκὸς γοῦν μετακληθῆναι αὐτὸν
ἐπὶ τὴν κρίσιν, ἧς νῦν ὁ κωμικὸς μνημονεύει.

1–7 Philoch. 328 F 127 FGrH

scholium vetus et triclinium 2 δὲ VAld: γὰρ Lh 2–3 ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος
Εὐκλέους om. Ald 3–4 μετὰ (κ') νεῶν dubitanter Jacoby coll. Thuc.
3.86.1, D.S. 12.54.4

112 Scholium in Aristophanis *Ranas* 1196 (307.14–20 Dübner)

15011 W μετ' Ἐρασινίδου· εἰς τῶν περὶ Ἀργίνουσαν στρατη-
γησάντων δυστυχῶς. ἀπέθανε δὲ δημοσία, οὗτός τε καὶ
οἱ ὑπομείναντες, Θράσυλλος, Περικλῆς, Λυσίας,
Ἀριστοκράτης, Διομέδων, ὥς φησι Φιλόχορος. Δημή-
τριος δέ φησι περιττότερόν τι γενέσθαι τῷ Ἐρασινίδῃ, τὸ 5
καὶ κλοπῆς κατηγορηθῆναι τῶν περὶ Ἑλλήσποντον
χρημάτων.

1–7 Philoch. 328 F 142 FGrH = Suda ε 3234 (LG 1.2.430.29–431.3
Adler) →

De Lycurgo

113 Plutarchus, *Lycurgus* 23.1–2 (BT 3.2.36.18–28 Ziegler)

89 W 1 αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Λυκοῦργον Ἰππίας μὲν ὁ σοφιστὴς
πολεμικώτατόν φησι γενέσθαι καὶ πολλῶν ἔμπειρον

the books I have written about the state.

111 Scholium on Aristophanes' *Wasps* 240a (SA 2.1.45.11–16 Koster)

(He [Aristophanes] says that¹) since Cleon was bringing suit against Laches. For according to Demetrius he (Laches) had been general during the archonship of Eucles three years earlier² when he was sent to Sicily with ships to support Leontini. According to those around Philochorus, Sophocles and Pythodorus took over his command and they were also punished with exile. However that may be, it is likely that he was recalled for the judicial examination to which the comic poet here refers.

¹ The leader of the chorus says to the chorus of wasps, "Come let us be stirring, sirs, for Laches shall catch it now" (Starkie).

² I.e., than the year in which the *Wasps* was produced (423/2 B.C.). Eucles was archon in 427/6.

112 Scholium on the *Frogs* of Aristophanes 1196 (307.14–20 Dübner)

With Erasinides: One of the admirals who had been defeated at Arginusae. He died by the hands of the public executioner, together with those who had been awaiting trial, Thrasyllus, Pericles, Lysias, Aristocrates, Diomedon, according to Philochorus. According to Demetrius, something (even) more extraordinary happened to Erasinides, i.e. that he was also accused of embezzlement of the Hellespont funds.

scholium vetus 1 εἰς *om. R: ἐκ Suda* 3–4 Περικλῆς—Διομέδων] Περικλῆς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ *Suda* 3 Λυσίας *add. Dindorf e Xen. HG 1.7.2: χύσις R: om. V* 4–5 ὥς φησι—γενέσθαι] ἐγένετο δέ τι καὶ περιττότερον *Suda* 4–7 Δημήτριος—χρημάτων *desunt in R*

On Lycurgus

113 Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 23.1–2 (BT 3.2.36.18–28 Ziegler)

- 1 Of Lycurgus himself¹ the sophist Hippias says that he was very warlike and had experience of many military expeditions.

στρατειῶν, Φιλοστέφανος δὲ καὶ τὴν κατ' οὐλαμοὺς τῶν
 ἱππέων διανομὴν Λυκούργῳ προστίθῃσιν· εἶναι δὲ τὸν
 2 οὐλαμόν, ὡς ἐκεῖνος συνέστησεν, ἱππέων πεντήκοντα 5
 πλῆθος ἐν τετραγώνῳ σχήματι τεταγμένων. ὁ δὲ
 Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος, οὐδεμιᾶς ἀψάμενον πολεμικῆς
 πράξεως ἐν εἰρήνῃ καταστήσασθαι τὴν πολιτείαν. ἔοικε
 δὲ καὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπιακῆς ἐκεχειρίας ἢ ἐπίνοια πράου καὶ
 πρὸς εἰρήνην οἰκείως ἔχοντος ἀνδρὸς εἶναι. 10

1–10 228 F 21 FGrH 1–3 Hippias 86 B 11 DK 3 Philosteph. FHG
 III 33

4 διανομὴν *S marg.* *L marg.*: διαμονὴν *S*: νομὴν *L* 5 ἔστησεν *L*¹ 6
 τεταγμένον *L*¹

Varia

De Thesei nave

114 Plutarchus, *Theseus* 23.1 (BT 1.1.20.13–20 Ziegler)

155 W

τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἐν ᾧ μετὰ τῶν ἡιθέων ἔπλευσε καὶ πάλιν
 ἐσώθη, τὴν τριακόντορον, ἄχρι τῶν Δημητρίου τοῦ
 Φαληρέως χρόνων διεφύλαττον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τὰ μὲν
 παλαιὰ τῶν ξύλων ὑφαιροῦντες, ἄλλα δ' ἐμβάλλοντες
 ἰσχυρὰ καὶ συμπηγνύντες οὕτως, ὥστε καὶ τοῖς 5
 φιλοσόφοις εἰς τὸν αὐξόμενον λόγον ἀμφιδοξούμενον
 παράδειγμα τὸ πλοῖον εἶναι, τῶν μὲν ὡς τὸ αὐτό, τῶν δ'
 ὡς οὐ τὸ αὐτὸ διαμένοι λεγόντων.

1–8 228 F 23 FGrH; cf. *Pl. Phd.* 58A10–B4

De ludis

115 Plutarchus, *De gloria Atheniensium* 6 349A–B (BT 2.131.1–
 3; 4–6; 10–18 Nachstädt)

ἂν γὰρ ἐκλογισθῇ τῶν δραμάτων ἕκαστον ὅσου
 κατέστη, πλεον ἄνηλωκῶς φανεῖται ὁ δῆμος εἰς Βάκχας
 καὶ (...), ὧν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡγεμονίας καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας
 πολεμῶν τοὺς βαρβάρους ἀνάλωσεν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ
 στρατηγοὶ (...)· οἱ δὲ χορηγοὶ τοῖς χορευταῖς ἐγγέλεια 5

Philostephanus also ascribes to Lycurgus the division of the cavalry into troops, a troop as organized by him being a squadron of
2 fifty horse drawn up in a square. But Demetrius of Phalerum (says) that he did not engage in any action of war and established his constitution in peace. The conception of the Olympic truce² also strikes one as coming from a man who was mild and a friend to peace.

¹ As opposed to the typically Spartan warlike mentality, referred to by Plutarch in 22.

² Instituted by him and Iphitus, Plu. *Lyc.* 1.2.

Miscellaneous

On the Ship of Theseus

114 Plutarch, *Theseus* 23.1 (*BT* 1.1.20.13–20 Ziegler)

The ship on which he (Theseus) sailed with his young men and returned home again safe, the one with thirty oars, was preserved by the Athenians down to the times of Demetrius of Phalerum. They regularly removed old timbers, put in other strong ones and fastened them, in such a way that for philosophers the ship was a (much) debated example in the growing controversy in which some argued that it (the ship) remained the same and others that it did not remain the same.

On Contests

115 Plutarch, *On the Fame of the Athenians* 6 349A–B (*BT* 2.131.1–3; 4–6; 10–18 Nachstädt)

For if one computes the cost of production of each of the plays, it will appear that the people have spent more on the *Bacchae* and on (...¹) than it spent in fighting the barbarians in defense of its leadership and its liberty. For the generals, on the one hand, (...²); the producers, on the other, served up for the chorus members

καὶ θριδάκια καὶ σκελίδας καὶ μυελὸν παρατιθέντες,
 136 W B εὐώχουν ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον φωνασκουμένους καὶ
 τρυφῶντας. καὶ τούτων τοῖς μὲν ἡττηθεῖσι περιῆν
 προσυβρίσθαι καὶ γεγονέναι καταγελάστους· τοῖς δὲ
 νικήσασιν ὁ τρίπους ὑπῆρχεν, οὐκ ἀνάθημα τῆς νίκης, 10
 ὡς Δημήτριός φησιν, ἀλλ' ἐπίσπαισμα τῶν ἐκκεχυμένων
 βίων καὶ τῶν ἐκλελοιπότων κενοτάφιον οἴκων. τοιαῦτα
 γὰρ τὰ ποιητικῆς τέλη καὶ λαμπρότερον οὐδὲν ἐξ αὐτῶν.

1–13 228 F 25 FGrH 9–13 cf. U. Koehler, *RhM* 53 (1898) 491–3

5 χορευταῖς ΦΠ: στρατευταῖς Σ 6 σκελίδας Reiske: σκελλίδας
codd. 7 ὁ Emperius: οὐ *codd.* 11–12 ἐπίσπαισμα—βίων Reiske:
 ἐπὶ πεισμάτων ἐκκεχυμένον βίον *codd.* 12 οἴκων Reiske: οἶκον
codd.

De metallis

116A Strabo, *Geographica* 3.2.9 (CB 2.42.4–43.6; 43.20 Lasserre)

Ποσειδώνιος δέ, τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μετάλλων ἐπαινῶν
 καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν, οὐκ ἀπέχεται τῆς συνήθους ῥητορείας,
 ἀλλὰ συνενθουσιᾷ ταῖς ὑπερβολαῖς. οὐ γὰρ ἀπιστεῖν τῷ
 μύθῳ φησὶν, ὅτι τῶν δρυμῶν ποτε ἐμπρησθέντων ἡ γῆ
 τακεῖσα, ἅτε ἀργυρίτις καὶ χρυσίτις, εἰς τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν 5
 ἐξέξεσε διὰ τὸ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ πάντα βουνὸν ὕλην εἶναι
 νομίσματος ὑπὸ τινος ἀφθόνου τύχης σεσωρευμένην.
 “Καθόλου δ' ἂν εἶπε,” φησὶν, “ιδὼν τις τοὺς τόπους, θησ-
 αυροὺς εἶναι φύσεως ἀενάους ἢ ταμιεῖον ἡγεμονίας
 ἀνέκλειπτον· οὐ γὰρ πλουσία μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπό- 10
 πλουτος ἦν,” φησὶν, “ἡ χώρα, καὶ παρ' ἐκείνοις ὡς
 ἀληθῶς τὸν ὑποχθόνιον τόπον οὐχ ὁ “Αἰδης, ἀλλ' ὁ
 Πλούτων κατοικεῖ.” τοιαῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῦρανῶϊ
 σχήματι εἶρηκε περὶ τούτων, ὡς ἂν ἐκ μετάλλου καὶ
 αὐτὸς πολλῶ χρώμενος τῷ λόγῳ. 15

138a W τὴν δ' ἐπιμέλειαν φράζων τὴν τῶν μεταλλευόντων
 παρατίθησι τὸ τοῦ Φαληρέως, ὅτι φησιν ἐκεῖνος ἐπὶ τῶν
 Ἀττικῶν ἀργυρείων οὕτω συντόνως ὀρύττειν τοὺς
 ἀνθρώπους, ὡς ἂν προσδοκόντων αὐτὸν ἀνάξειν τὸν
 Πλούτωνα· καὶ τούτων οὖν ἐμφανίζει παραπλησίαν τὴν 20

nice little eels and small crops of lettuce and spare ribs and marrow, feasting them at length while they trained their voice and
 B lived in luxury. For those of them (the producers) who were beaten, there was nothing left but to be the object of scorn and ridicule; but for those who won, there was the tripod, this being, as Demetrius says, not a votive offering to celebrate their victory, but a last libation of their spilt livelihood and an empty memorial of their bankrupt estates. For such were the rewards of the art of poetry and nothing more splendid (ever) came from them.

¹ The other plays listed are *Phoenissae*, *Oedipus*, *Antigone*, *Medea* and *Electra*.

² Here Plutarch reports the meagre diet on which the Athenian soldiers had to fight.

On Mines

116A Strabo, *Geography* 3.2.9 (CB 2.42.4–43.6; 43.20 Lasserre)

In praising the quantity and quality of the metals (in Turdetania¹) Posidonius does not abstain from his usual rhetoric; on the contrary, he completely loses himself in hyperboles: he says he well believes the story that once, when the forests caught fire, the earth melted, since it contained silver- and gold-ore, and boiled out to the surface because of the fact that every mountain and every hill was material of coin piled up by an ungrudging fortune. “In sum”, he says, “anyone looking at the area would have said that it was an everlasting treasure house of nature or the un-failing treasury of an empire. For the country was not just rich, but even rich underneath”, he says, “and with these people it is truly not Hades but Pluto who inhabits the nether regions.” Of this kind, then, are the things he says on this subject in a †heaven(ly)†² style, drawing a mass of speech as if from a mine himself too.

In illustrating the diligence of the miners he cites what the Phalerean says with reference to the Attic silver-mines, (viz.) that the men dig as intently as if they expected to bring up Pluto himself. So in their (the miners in Turdetania) case too, he (Posidonius) indicates that their zeal and industry are similar, cutting their shafts aslant and deep, and as to the waterstreams they

σπουδὴν καὶ τὴν φιλεργίαν, σκολιάς τεμνόντων καὶ
 βαθείας τὰς σύριγγας, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐν αὐταῖς
 ἀπαντῶντας ποταμοὺς πολλάκις τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις
 ἀναντλούντων κοχλίας. †τὸν δόλον† οὐ ταῦτὸν εἶναι
 τούτοις τε καὶ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς, ἀλλ' ἐκείνοις μὲν αἰνίγματι 25
 εἰκέναι τὴν μεταλλείαν. “ὅσα μὲν γὰρ ἀνέλαβον,”
 φησὶν, “οὐκ ἔλαβον, ὅσα δὲ εἶχον, ἀπέβαλον.” τούτοις δ'
 ὑπεράγαν λυσιτελεῖν, ... οὗτος μὲν περὶ τῶν μετάλλων
 τοιαῦτ' εἶρηκε.

1–29 *Posidon. F 239 Edelstein-Kidd = 87 F 47 FGrH* 16–27 228 F
 35a FGrH 24–7 v. ad 116B.8–10 25 αἰνίγματι] cf. *Homeri Vitam*
Herodoteam 35

[B = *Vatop.* 655 (= W); j = *Laur.* 28.5 (= B)] 5 τακεῖσα *Xylander*:
 τὰ καινὰ *codd.* 9 ἀενάους *Kramer*: ἀεννάου *codd.*: ἀενάου
Lasserre 10 ἀνέκλειπτον *Planudes*: ἀνεκλείπτου AC: ἀνεκλίπτου
 B 13 †τοῦρανῶ†] ὠραίῳ *A^mg^jh^q*: ῥητορικῶ *h^{γρ}i^{γρ}* 18 ἀργυρείων
h^q: ἀργυρίων ABC 19 προσδοκόντων AC: προσδοκόντων B:
 προσδοκῶντας *j^hh^q* 20 τού-των A: τοῦτον BC || παραπλησίαν *j^hh^q*:
 καὶ παραπλησίαν ABC 22 πρὸς *del. Korais* 24 ἀναντλούντων →

116B *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae* 6.23 233D–E (BT 2.24.4–14
 Kaibel)

καὶ τὰ τε πάλαι μὲν Ῥιπαῖα καλούμενα ὄρη, εἶθ'
 ὕστερον Ὀλβια προσαγορευθέντα, νῦν δὲ Ἀλπια (ἔστι
 δὲ τῆς Γαλατίας) αὐτομάτως ὕλης ἐμπρησθείσης ἀρ-
 γύρῳ διερρύη. τὸ μέντοι γε πολὺ τούτου βαθείαις καὶ 5
 κακοπαθέσι μεταλλείαις εὐρίσκεται κατὰ τὸν Φαληρέα
 Δημήτριον ἐλπίζούσης τῆς πλεονεξίας ἀνάξειν ἐκ τῶν
 μυχῶν τῆς γῆς αὐτὸν τὸν Πλούτωνα. χαριεντιζόμενος
 γοῦν φησιν ὅτι “πολλάκις καταναλώσαντες τὰ φανερά
 τῶν ἀδήλων ἔνεκα ἃ μὲν ἔμελλον οὐκ ἔλαβον, ἃ δ' εἶχον 10
 ἀπέβαλον ὥσπερ αἰνίγματος τρόπον ἀτυχοῦντες.”

1–10 *Ath. Epit.* (2.1.90.9–16 *Peppink*) [= EC]; *Posidon. F 240a*
Edelstein-Kidd = 87 F 48(b) FGrH 1–7 *similiter Eust. Od.* 4.89
 (1.151.43–152.2 *Stallbaum*) (= *Posidon. F 240b Edelstein-Kidd*), *qui*
apophthegma Demetrii non laudat 4–10 228 F 35b FGrH 8–10
D.S. 5.37.1, *ubi Demetrius non nominatur* →

meet with in the shafts, often drawing them off with Egyptian screws. (But) †the bait†³ is not the same for these miners as for those in Attica; no, for the latter mining is like a riddle: “all they took up,” he says, “they did not get; all that they had, they lost.”⁴ For the former, on the other hand, it is much too profitable, ... Such is what he (Posidonius) says about the mines.

¹ In southern Spain.

² The text appears to be corrupt; the variant reading in the margin of A would give “fully developed.”

³ The text appears to be corrupt; the other readings would give “on the whole the situation is not the same” and “the account is not the same” respectively.

⁴ The riddle is modelled on the Homeric riddle (*Life of Homer* 35) of unsuccessful fisher boys catching lice instead: “What we caught we left behind; what we did not catch we carry with us.”

Korais: ἀνατλοῦντα AB: ἀναπλοῦντας C || κοχλίας *Casaubon*: σκολιαῖς *codd.* || †τὸν δόλον†] τὸ δ' ὅλον *h^pc i*, *Scaliger*: τὸν δὲ λόγον οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι *l^pc* 25 τούτοις τε καὶ *Korais*: τοῦτόν ποτε καὶ A: τοῦτό ποτε καὶ BC: τούτοις ποτὲ καὶ *l^pc* 26 ἀνέλαβον A: ἄν ἔλαβον BC

116B Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 6.23 233D–E (BT 2.24.4–14 Kaibel)

E And the mountains that long ago were called Rhipaeian, then later on were spoken of as Olbian, and nowadays as Albian—they are in Galatia—, spontaneously oozed silver when a forest fire broke out. Most of it, however, is found by mining at a deep level and under wretched conditions, as Demetrius of Phalerum says, for the greed (of the miners) expects to bring up out of the recesses of the earth Pluto himself. At least he says, with a witty play upon words, that “often they spent the things that are visible for the sake of things invisible; what they were going to (get) they did not get, and what they had they lost, having bad luck as it were in the manner of the riddle.”

5 κακοπαθέσι E: κακοπάθοις AC, *Eust.* 8–9 πολλάκις—ἐνεκα *om.* D.S. 9 ἃ—ἔμελλον] ἃ μὲν ἤλπισαν ἐνίστε λαβεῖν D.S. 10 ὥσπερ—ἀτυχοῦντες] ὥστε δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς ὥσπερ αἰνίγματος τρόπον ἀτυχεῖν D.S.

De pretio victimarum

117 Plutarchus, *Solon* 23.3–4 (BT 1.1.110.14–24 Ziegler)

- 3 εἰς μὲν γε τὰ τιμήματα τῶν θυσιῶν λογίζεται πρό-
 βατον καὶ δραχμὴν ἀντὶ μεδίμνου, τῷ δ' Ἰσθμια
 νικήσαντι δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν ἔταξε δίδοσθαι, τῷ δ'
 147 W Ὀλυμπιονίκη πεντακοσίας, λύκον δὲ τῷ κομίσαντι
 πέντε δραχμὰς, λυκιδέα δὲ μίαν, ὧν φησιν ὁ Φαληρεὺς 5
 4 Δημήτριος τὸ μὲν βοὸς εἶναι, τὸ δὲ προβάτου τιμήν. ὅς
 γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἑκκαίδεκάτῳ τῶν ἀξόνων ὀρίζει τιμὰς τῶν
 ἑκκρίτων ἱερείων, εἰκὸς μὲν εἶναι πολλαπλασίας, ἄλλως
 δὲ κακεῖναι πρὸς τὰς νῦν εὐτελεῖς εἰσιν. ἀρχαῖον δὲ τοῖς
 Ἀθηναίοις τὸ πολεμεῖν τοῖς λύκοις, βελτίονα νέμειν ἢ 10
 γεωργεῖν χώραν ἔχουσι.

1–11 = *Solon T 8 Ruschenbusch* 1–2 = *Solon T 485 Martina = F 77
 Ruschenbusch* 2–6 228 F 22 FGrH 2–4 = *Solon T 484a Martina
 = F 143a Ruschenbusch; cf. D.L. 1.55* 4–11 = *Solon T 486
 Martina* 4–6 = *Solon F 92 Ruschenbusch*

4 ὀλυμπιονίκη S: ὀλύμπια Smarg. Y 5 ὧν Stephanus: ὡς codd., sed
 supra lin. S 9 τὰς νῦν Stephanus: τὰ νῦν codd.

On the Price of Sacrificial Animals

117 Plutarch, *Solon* 23.3–4 (*BT* 1.1.110.14–24 Ziegler)

- 3 With respect to the valuation of sacrifices he (Solon) reckons a sheep and one drachma as the equivalent of one bushel (of grain); he fixed the prize to be awarded to a victor at the Isthmian Games at one hundred drachmas, for one at the Olympic Games at five hundred, for bringing in a wolf five drachmas, and a wolf-whelp one drachma, the first being the price of an ox and the second of a
- 4 sheep according to Demetrius of Phalerum. These prices for select sacrificial animals specified by him in the sixteenth of his Tables are naturally many times as high (as those for ordinary animals), and even so these (prices) are affordable compared to current ones. The Athenians have been fighting wolves from days immemorial, their land being better suited to pasture than to agriculture.

Orationes, Rhetorica et Poetica

cf. dictum Demetrii in **133.37–8**

Inscriptiones librorum

118 Tabula inscriptionum ad orationes, opera rhetorica et poetica spectantium

- 1 Δημηγοριῶν Συναγωγή] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = **1.62–3** (δημηγοριῶν ... συναγωγαί)
- 2 Πρεσβειῶν Συναγωγή] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = **1.62–3** (πρεσβειῶν ... συναγωγαί)
- 3 Βοιωτιακός] *Tabula Rhodiensis*, col. I 1 = **80.1**
- 4 Πρεσβευτικὸς α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.88**
- 5 Περὶ ῥητορικῆς α' β'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = **1.70**; Philodemus, *De Rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 48.2–3 = **132.2–3** (ἐν [τ]ῷ περὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς); *PHerc.* 1015, fr. 6.5–6 = **141.5–6** (ἐν τοῖς πε[ρὶ τῆς ῥη]τορικῆς); Scholium ad Tzetzae *Chiliadas* 5.209 = **148.4** (Ῥητορικῆς)
- 6 Περὶ πίστεως α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.89**
- 7 Αἰσωπείων α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.108**; cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.80 = **1.63** (λόγων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγαί)
- 8 Ὀμηρικὸς α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.81**
- 9 Περὶ Ἰλιάδος α' β'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.72**
- 10 Περὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας α' β' γ' δ'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.73**
- 11 Περὶ Ἀντιφάνους α'] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = **1.102**

cf. Δημητρίου Φαληρέως Περὶ ἐρμηνείας = **159–60** et
Δημητρίου [Φαληρέως] τύποι ἐπιστολικοί = **161**

inscriptiones Δικανικῶν Λόγων Συναγωγή et Σοφιστικῶν vel Ἐπιδεικτικῶν Λόγων Συναγωγή, quas Wehrli p. 37 per similitudinem inscriptionum Δημηγοριῶν Συναγωγή et Πρεσβειῶν Συναγωγή (nos. 1–2) per coniecturam posuit, in hoc volumine non receptae sunt

Speeches, Rhetoric and Poetics

cp. the saying of Demetrius in **133.37–8**

Titles of Books

118 List of Titles Referring to Speeches and to Works on Rhetoric and Poetics

- 1 *Collection of Public Speeches*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.62–3** (“collections ... of public speeches”)
- 2 *Collection of embassy addresses*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.62–3** (“collections ... of embassy addresses”)
- 3 *Boeotian (Speech)*] *Rhodian Book Catalogue*, col. I 1 = **80.1**
- 4 *Ambassadorial Address*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.88**
- 5 *On (the Art of) Rhetoric*, 2 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.70**; Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 48.2–3 = **132.2–3** (“in his *On Rhetoric*”); *PHerc.* 1015, fr. 6.5–6 = **141.5–6** (“in his *On Rhetoric*”); Scholium on the *Chiliads* of Tzetzes 5.209 = **148.4** (“in his *Rhetoric*”)
- 6 *On Proof (or On Trust)*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.89**
- 7 *Aesopic Fables*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.108**; cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.80 = **1.63** (“collections ... of Aesopic fables”)
- 8 *(Dialogue) on Homer*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.81**
- 9 *On the Iliad*, 2 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.72**
- 10 *On the Odyssey*, 4 books] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.73**
- 11 *On Antiphanes*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = **1.102**

cp. Demetrius [of Phalerum], *On Style* = **159–60** and

Demetrius of Phalerum, *Models for letter-writing* = **161**

the titles *Collection of Forensic Speeches* and *Collection of Sophistic or Epideictic Speeches*, which Wehrli p. 37 posited on the analogy of the titles *Collection of Public Speeches* and *Collection of embassy addresses* (nos. 1–2), have not been accepted in this edition

De Demetrii elocutione iudicia

119 Cicero, *De Officiis* 1.1.3 (OCT 2.4–16 Winterbottom)

73,176 W

quam ob rem magnopere te hortor, mi Cicero, ut non solum orationes meas, sed hos etiam de philosophia libros, qui iam illis fere se aequarunt, studiose legas; vis enim maior in illis dicendi, sed hoc quoque colendum est
 5 aequabile et temperatum orationis genus. et id quidem nemini video Graecorum adhuc contigisse, ut idem utroque in genere laboraret sequereturque et illud forense dicendi et hoc quietum disputandi genus: nisi forte Demetrius Phalereus in hoc numero haberi potest, disputator subtilis,
 10 orator parum vehemens, dulcis tamen, ut Theophrasti discipulum possis agnoscere. nos autem quantum in utroque profecerimus, aliorum sit iudicium: utrumque certe secuti sumus.

5–11 228 T 9a FGrH = *Thphr. no. 52B FHS&G* 10–11 Theophrasti discipulum] *cf. Thphr. no. 18.5 FHS&G et v. 8*

3 illis] illos *Vindob. 315, Lambinus: illas Facciolatus* || qui iam illis fere se c+: qui se iam illis fere S: qui se illis fere M: se om. BPV, Lambinus 7 elaboraret *Guelf. 4454, Lambinus*

120 Cicero, *De Oratore* 2.23.95 (BT 3.143.4–10 Kumaniecki)

174 W

postea quam extinctis his omnis eorum memoria sensim obscurata est et evanuit, alia quaedam dicendi molliora ac remissiora genera viguerunt. inde Demochares, quem aiunt sororis filium fuisse Demostheni; tum Phalereus ille Demetrius omnium istorum mea sententia politissimus,
 5 alique horum similes exstiterunt.

1–6 228 T 9b FGrH = *Democh. 75 T 4 FGrH; de Demochare cf. 89*

5 politissimus *E¹ et recc. (VOPUR): potentissimus AHE⁴*

121 Cicero, *Brutus* 9.37–8 (BT 4.11.4–16 Malcovati)

175 W

37

Phalereus enim successit eis senibus adulescens

Judgments on Demetrius' Elocution

119 Cicero, *On Duties* 1.1.3 (*OCT* 2.4–16 Winterbottom)

That is why I strongly advise you, my dear Cicero,¹ to study closely not only my speeches, but also these books on philosophy (which indeed are almost equal to the former), for there is more rhetorical power in the former, yet this even and moderate genre of discourse should also be cultivated. Here is something that I do not find any of the Greeks so far has attained: that one and the same person is active in either genre and cultivates both the former genre of judicial speech and this latter genre of calm discussion—unless perhaps Demetrius of Phalerum is to be counted among this number: a subtle disputer, a speaker somewhat lacking in force but none the less charming, in whom you may recognize the pupil of Theophrastus. Now how much progress I have made in either genre, others may judge; certainly I have cultivated both.

¹ His son Marcus Tullius Cicero.

120 Cicero, *On the Orator* 2.23.95 (*BT* 3.143.4–10 Kumaniecki)

Later, when these men¹ were dead and all memory of them had gradually faded and vanished, certain other kinds flourished which were softer and more relaxed. Thereupon Demochares came to the fore, who they say was the son of a sister of Demosthenes; and then the renowned man from Phalerum, Demetrius, to my mind² the most polished of them all, and others resembling these two.

¹ The generation of Demosthenes, Hyperides, Lycurgus, Aeschines, and Dinarchus.

² Antonius is speaking.

121 Cicero, *Brutus* 9.37–8 (*BT* 4.11.4–16 Malcovati)

37 Indeed, when these men¹ were old, they were succeeded by a

- eruditissimus ille quidem horum omnium, sed non tam armis institutus quam palaestra. itaque delectabat magis Atheniensis quam inflammabat. processerat enim in solem et pulverem non ut e militari tabernaculo, sed ut e 5
- 38 Theophrasti doctissimi hominis umbraculis. hic primus inflexit orationem et eam mollem teneramque reddidit et suavis, sicut fuit, videri maluit quam gravis, sed suavitate ea, qua perfunderet animos, non qua perfringeret; [et] tantum ut memoriam concinnitatis suae, non, quemad- 10 modum de Pericle scripsit Eupolis, cum delectatione aculeos etiam relinqueret in animis eorum, a quibus esset auditus.

1–8 228 *T 9b FGrH* 4–6 processerat—umbraculis] *cf.* 57.13–16 5–6 sed—umbraculis] *Macrob. Sat.* 6.4.8 6 Theophrasti] *cf. Thphr. no.* 18.5 *FHS&G et v. 8* 11 Eupolis] *Eupolis Demi F 102.6–7 PCG K.-A., ubi v. testimonia (V 354)*

3 palaestrae *Lambinus* 9 et *secl. Manutius*

122 Cicero, *Brutus* 82.285 (BT 4.88.10–19 Malcovati)

- “Atticos,” inquit, “volo imitari.” quos? nec enim est unum genus. nam quid est tam dissimile quam Demosthenes et Lysias, quam idem et Hyperides, quam horum omnium Aeschines? quem igitur imitaris? si aliquem: ceteri ergo Attice non dicebant? si omnis: qui 5
- 177 W potes, cum sint ipsi dissimillumi inter se? in quo illud etiam quaero, Phalereus ille Demetrius Atticene dixerit. mihi quidem ex illius orationibus redolere ipsae Athenae videntur. at est floridior, ut ita dicam, quam Hyperides, quam Lysias: natura quaedam aut voluntas ita dicendi fuit. 10

1–10 228 *T 9b FGrH*

3 iidem *O* 4 si *in ras.* *F ex sed: sed rell.*

123 Quintilianus, *Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.33 (OCT 2.574.5–12 Winterbottom)

adde quod M. Tullius ne Thucydiden quidem aut

- young man from Phalerum, more learned than any of them, but formed on the training ground (of a philosophic school) rather than on the battlefield (of the courtroom or the assembly). As a result he delighted rather than inflamed the Athenians. For he had come out into the sunlight and dust, not as from a soldier's tent, but from the shady retreat of Theophrastus, a most scholarly man.
- 38 It was he (Demetrius) who first changed the style of oratory, making it soft and delicate; he wished to appear agreeable, as indeed he was, rather than grave, that is to say agreeable so as to filter through to the mind rather than to break it into pieces. Hence the memory he left in the minds of those who heard him, was one of elegant harmony, unlike Pericles, who, in the words of Eupolis, with all the delight he brought, left a sting behind.

¹ The generation of Lysias, Demosthenes, Hyperides, Aeschines, Lycurgus, Dinarchus, Demades.

122 Cicero, *Brutus* 82.285 (BT 4.88.10–19 Malcovati)

“I want to imitate the Attic (orators),” he (Calvus) says.¹ Which ones? For there is not just one kind. Indeed, what greater difference is there than between Demosthenes and Lysias, these two and Hyperides, all of these and Aeschines? So whom are you going to imitate? If one of them, does that mean the others did not speak Attic; if all of them, how will you be able to do that, seeing that they are so very different from one another? In this connection, let me also ask you this: did Demetrius of Phalerum speak Attic? If you ask me, his speeches seem to be redolent of Athens itself. But he is more flowery, so to speak, than Hyperides, than Lysias: a natural disposition or a preference made him speak like that.

¹ This is a fictitious quotation from C. Licinius Calvus, who practised a severe Atticism.

123 Quintilian, *Oratorical Education* 10.1.33 (OCT 2.574.5–12 Winterbottom)

Add to this that M. Tullius does not think even Thucydides or

178 W Xenophontem utiles oratori putat, quamquam illum
 “bellicum canere,” huius ore “Musas esse locutas” exist-
 imet. licet tamen nobis in digressionibus uti uel historico
 nonnumquam nitore, dum in iis de quibus erit quaestio 5
 meminerimus non athletarum toris sed militum lacertis
 <opus> esse, nec uersicolorem illam qua Demetrius
 Phalereus dicebatur uti uestem bene ad forensem puluerem
 facere.

1–8 228 T 9b FGrH 1–2 Thucydiden—Xenophontem] cf. Cic. Or.
 9.30–2 3 bellum canere] cf. Cic. Or. 11.39 || Musas esse locutas] cf.
 Cic. Or. 19.62 7–8 uersicolorem—uestem] cf. Theophrasti iudicium
 de Bione (Thphr. no. 18.3 FHS&G = Bion T 13 Kindstrand) 8 pulue-
 rem] cf. 57.15; 121.5

1 adde quod Regius: audeo quia G: quod dicere fortius audeo quia ed.
 Col. 1527 3 canere ed. Col. 1527: canerem G || ore ... locutas t:
 oremus has esse locutis G 7 opus add. ed. Col. 1527

124 Cicero, *Orator* 26.91–2; 94–6 (BT 5.27.6–14; 28.9–29.2
 Westman)

179 W 91 uberius est aliud aliquantoque robustius quam hoc
 humile de quo dictum est, summissius autem quam illud de
 quo iam dicetur amplissimum. hoc in genere nervorum vel
 minimum, suauitatis autem est vel plurimum. est enim
 plenius quam hoc enucleatum, quam autem illud ornatum 5
 92 copiosumque summissius. huic omnia dicendi ornamenta
 conveniunt plurimumque est in hac orationis forma
 suauitatis. in qua multi floruerunt apud Graecos, sed
 Phalereus Demetrius meo iudicio praestitit ceteris; cuius
 oratio cum sedate placideque liquitur tum illustrant eam 10
 94 quasi stellae quaedam tralata verba atque mutata. ... haec
 frequentat Phalereus maxime, suntque dulcissima, et
 quanquam tralatio est apud eum multa, tamen immutationes
 95 nusquam crebriores. in idem genus orationis (loquor enim
 de illa modica ac temperata) verborum cadunt lumina 15
 omnia, multa etiam sententiarum; latae eruditaeque
 disputationes ab eodem explicabuntur et loci communes
 sine contentione dicentur. quid multa? e philosophorum

Xenophon useful to the orator, although it is his estimate that the one “sounds for war” and that with the other’s lips “the Muses have spoken.” Still, on occasion we may use even the splendor of history in our digressions, provided we bear in mind that in dealing with the issues under consideration, what is needed is not the athlete’s brawn but the sinews of a soldier, and that the many-coloured coat which Demetrius of Phalerum was said to have worn, is no good for the dust of the forum.

124 Cicero, *Orator* 26.91–2; 94–6 (*BT* 5.27.6–14; 28.9–29.2 Westman)

- 91 There is another kind (of style), richer and with a little more power than the plain one about which I have spoken, but less elevated than the grandest kind about which I am yet to speak. This kind has a minimum of muscle, but a maximum of agreeableness. For it is fuller than the unadorned kind, but less elevated than the
- 92 ornate and copious kind. All ornaments of speech suit this style of oratory and it has the greatest agreeableness. Among the Greeks, many have distinguished themselves in it, but to my mind Demetrius of Phalerum surpasses the others. His oratory flows gently and quietly, but at the same time it is brightened, as if by a kind of stars, by the ‘transferred’ and ‘mutated’ use of words. ...¹
- 94 The Phalerean uses these (devices) with the utmost frequency and they are most charming; and though there is a lot of metaphor in
- 95 him, yet no one has more ‘mutations’. This same kind of style—I am still speaking of this moderate and mixed kind—admits all figures of speech, and many of thought too. It also lends itself well for developing wide-ranging and learned disputations and for expressing general ideas without the heat of debate. Why use many words? Orators of this kind are as a rule produced by the

scholis tales fere evadunt, et nisi coram erit comparatus ille
96 fortior, per se hic quem dico probabitur. est enim quoddam 20
etiam insigne et florens orationis pictum et expolitum ge-
nus, in quo omnes verborum, omnes sententiarum illigantur
lepores. hoc totum e sophistarum fontibus defluxit in forum,
sed spretum a subtilibus, repulsum a gravibus in ea de qua
loquor mediocritate consedit. 25

2 dictum est] 23.76–26.90 3 iam] 28.97–9 6–8 huic—suavitatis]
similiter Iulius Victor Rhet. 22,438, p. 92.27–8 *Celentano* 16–18
latae—dicentur] = *Iul. Vict. Rhet.* 22,438, p. 92.28–93.1 *Cel.* 23–5
hoc—consedit] = *Iul. Vict. Rhet.* 22,438, p. 93.1–3 *Cel.*

3 nervorum *L*: verborum *AT*²(*al.*)*Bud.* 7 orationis] ornamenti *A* 10
liquitur *AΣΦΨV*: loquitur *LΔΘΞ* 11 mutata *AμΨ*: immutata *L* 13
multa *LμΨ*: multae *A*: mutata *Φ* || mutationes *PJ* 17 explicantur *L*
18 dicentur *A*, *Iul. Vict.*: dicuntur *L* 20 quem dico *L*: quod dico *A*:
quidem *R* 22 inligantur *FUS*: illigatarum *A* 24 de] demum *Iul. Vict.*:
om. BQV

125 Quintilianus, *Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.80 (OCT 2.583.18–24
Winterbottom)

neque ego in his, de quibus sum locutus, has solas
uirtutes, sed has praecipuas puto, nec ceteros parum fuisse
180 W magnos. Quin etiam Phalerea illum Demetrium, quamquam
is primus inclinasse eloquentiam dicitur, multum ingenii
habuisse et facundiae fateor, uel ob hoc memoria dignum, 5
quod ultimus est fere ex Atticis qui dici possit orator, quem
tamen in illo medio genere dicendi praefert omnibus Cicero.

1–7 228 *T 9b FG rH*
2 peto *Y* 6 quem *XY*: quae *G*

De exercitatione dicendi

126 Quintilianus, *Institutio Oratoria* 2.4.41–2 (OCT 1.87.10–17
Winterbottom)

41 his fere ueteres facultatem dicendi exercuerunt,
182 W adsumpta tamen a dialecticis argumentandi ratione. nam

philosophic schools; the type of orator I have in mind here will be appreciated for his own sake, as long as he is not directly compared with the stronger type of orator. For (his) is a certain distinguished and flowery kind of style, embellished and polished, in which all graceful allurements of word and thought are interwoven. Wholly originating from the sophists, its course has been down on to the forum; but spurned by the plain orators and rejected by the grave, it has settled down in the middle position here defined.

¹ Cicero here explains the terms 'transferred' as referring to metaphor, and 'mutated', 'mutations' as referring to metonymy.

125 Quintilian, *Oratorical Education* 10.1.80 (*OCT* 2.583.18–24 Winterbottom)

It is not so that in the orators I have spoken about,¹ I consider the virtues mentioned the only ones, but I do consider them the most important ones. Nor do I think that the other orators have been of little importance; on the contrary, I admit that Demetrius of Phalerum too, even though he is said to have ushered in the decline of eloquence, had a great deal of talent and fluency; yes, he is worth remembering for the very reason that he is just about the last of the Attic school who can be called an orator. After all, in that middle kind of oratory, Cicero prefers him to all the others.

¹ I.e., the canonical ten of whom Quintilian in 76–9 mentions Demosthenes, Aeschines, Hyperides, Lysias and Isocrates.

On rhetorical training

126 Quintilian, *Oratorical Education* 2.4.41–2 (*OCT* 1.87.10–17 Winterbottom)

41 It was generally on these subjects¹ that the ancients practised their skill in speaking; they did so, it is true, by making use of the

fictas ad imitationem fori consiliorumque materias apud Graecos dicere circa Demetrium Phalerea institutum fere
 42 constat. an ab ipso id genus exercitationis sit inuentum, ut 5
 alio quoque libro sum confessus, parum comperi: sed ne ii
 quidem qui hoc fortissime adfirmant ullo satis idoneo auctore nituntur.

2–8 228 T 9c FGrH; cf. Philostr. VS 1.481

5 constat] constabat A 6 ii] hi AB

De narratione apud Demetrium

127 Anonymus Seguerianus, *Ars rhetorica* 125–8 (RhGr 1.373.21–374.9 Hammer)

184 W 125 Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁ τοῦ Νουμηνίου καὶ Νεοκλῆς οὐ
 μίαν ἀποδεδώκασιν αὐτῇ τάξιν, ἀλλὰ ἄλλοτε ἄλλην.
 126 ἐνίοτε καὶ πρό τε τοῦ προοιμίου, ὅποταν ὁ δικαστὴς
 προηρεθισμένος ἦ καὶ σπεύδῃ πρὸς τὸ μαθεῖν τὸ πρᾶγμα.
 127 ἔστι δὲ ὅτε καὶ μετὰ τὰς πίστεις, ὥσπερ Αἰσχίνην τέ 5
 φασιν ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμάρχου πεποιηκέναι καὶ Δημο-
 σθένην ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μειδίου· τοῦτο δὲ ἀρμόζειν, ἥνικα
 (ᾧ) ἰσχυρότερον οἱ ἀντίδικοι προβεβληκότες ὦσι τὰς
 διηγήσεις· προμαλαχθέντα γὰρ τὸν δικαστὴν ταῖς
 128 πίστεσι ῥαδίως παραδέχεσθαι τὴν διήγησιν. παρὰ μὲν 10
 οὖν Δημητρίῳ τῷ Φαληρεῖ φασιν ἐν ἐπιλόγῳ καὶ μετ’
 ἐπίλογον κεῖσθαι διήγησιν· ἀρμόζειν γὰρ τὸ τοιοῦτον,
 ὅταν σφόδρα ὑπὸ τῶν κατηγορῶν καταληφθῶσιν οἱ
 δικασταί.

1–14 Anon. Seguer. *Ars rhetorica* 125–8 (RhGr 1.442.13–25 Spengel)
 = Caec. Cal. F *20 (BT 14.4–18 Ofenloch) 6 ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμάρχου]
 Aeschin. Or. 1.9–115 7 ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μειδίου] Dem. Or. 21.77–126

3 τε P: γε Finckh 5 post ὅτε inser. ἐν ταῖς πίστεσι Graeven 7 ᾧ
 add. Sauppe: om. P 8 προδιαβεβληκότες Graeven 11 ἐπιλόγοις
 Spengel 13 σφόδρα P: σφοδρότερον Finckh

42 dialecticians' method of argumentation. For it is generally accepted that (the method of) speaking on fictitious subjects to simulate the courtroom and the political assembly, was introduced among the Greeks around the time of Demetrius of Phalerum. Whether this kind of practice was invented by him personally, I have been unable to ascertain with certainty, as I have acknowledged also in another book.² However that may be, even those who most strongly affirm this, fail to adduce any sufficiently reliable authority.

¹ In chapter 4 Quintilian enumerates a number of basic exercises of rhetorical training, the last of them being "praise and criticism of the laws" (4.33).

² Probably the lost *The causes of the decline of oratory*. See D.A. Russell, *Greek Declamation*, 1983, 18–19, and K. Heldmann, *Antike Theorien über Entwicklung und Verfall der Redekunst*, 1982, 99–122.

On the Narration in Demetrius

127 Anonymus Seguerianus, *Rhetoric* 125–8 (*RhGr* 1.373.21–374.9 Hammer)

125 But Alexander, the son of Numenius, and Neocles¹ have assigned to it (the narration) not one position, but positions varying
126 with the circumstances: In some cases even before the prooemium, whenever the juror has already been put into an irritated state of mind and is eager to learn the facts of the case.
127 Sometimes too after the proof, as we are told Aeschines did in his speech *Against Timarchus* and Demosthenes in his speech *Against Midias*. This position is apposite whenever the opponents have already had the chance to deploy their statement of the case rather effectively. For when the juror has first been put in a more friendly frame of mind by the proof, then he accepts the narration
128 all the more readily. In Demetrius of Phalerum the narration is said to be placed in the epilogue and even after the epilogue. For such a procedure is apposite, whenever the accusers have a strong grip on the jurors.

¹ For Alexander see *RE* 1.2, 1458; for Neocles *RE* 16.2, 2417–19.

De Figuris a Demetrio adhibitis

cf. Demetrium, *De elocutione* 289 (BT 59.4–12 Radermacher)
= 12

128 Rutilius Lupus, *De figuris* 2.16 (41.1–4; 7; 15–17; 19–26 Brooks)

ANTITHETON

hoc pluribus modis fieri solet et habet in omni genere orationis summam utilitatem. quare separatim demonstrandum est de uno quoque genere eius. unum est, cum contrariae res inter se conferuntur. ... hoc idem fieri potest in una persona.... est autem genus huius, quod in eadem sententia priori verbo contrarium quod est, infert, et coniungi solet. ... aliud est, item quod superiori infertur, sed consequenter, ita uti fecit Demetrius Phalereus: Nobis primis dii immortales fruges dederunt; nos, quod soli accepimus, per omnes terras distribuimus. nobis maiores nostri rem publicam reliquerunt; nos etiam socios nostros de servitute eripuimus. itaque et amplissimus nobis honos ab omnibus habetur, et propter huius[modi] honoris dignitatem superbiae nostrae nemo vestigium experitur.

1 ANTITHETON] cf. *Auct. ad Her.* 4.18.25 et 15.21; *Cic. Or.* 50.166–7; *Quint. Inst.* 9.3.81–6; 9.2.101; 9.3.92; *Carmen de Figuris* 22–4 9–11 Nobis—distribuimus e *Rutilio laudatur a Quintiliano Inst.* 9.3.84 (*OCT* 2.531.18–19 Winterbottom), sine mentione Demetrii

2 modis *B*: moribus *AV* 6 <aliud> genus *Halm* 8 coniungi *BV*: lac. *A* 10 nos quod *AV*: quod nos *B* 11 per] in *Quint.* 12 rem publicam <liberam> *Halm* 13 eripuimus *AB*: eripimus *V* 14 huiusmodi *A*: huius *edd.* 15 superbiae nostrae nemo *BV*: superbientem nemo *A* || nemo ... experitur] ne ... reperitur *Ruhnken, Brooks*

129 Rutilius Lupus, *De figuris* 1.1 (5.1–4; 9–14 Brooks)

PROSAPODOSIS

hoc schema duobus modis fieri et tractari potest. nam sentiis duabus aut pluribus propositis sua cuique ratio vel posterius reddetur, vel statim sub unaquaque sententia subiungetur. quibus posterius ratio subinfertur, huius modi

On Figures as Used by Demetrius

cp. Demetrius, *On Style* 289 (BT 59.4–12 Radermacher) = 12

- 128** Rutilius Lupus, *On Figures* 2.16 (41.1–4; 7; 15–17; 19–26 Brooks)

ANTITHESIS (*antitheton*)

This (figure) is regularly effected in several ways and is of the greatest use in every kind of speech. For that reason every single type of it must be illustrated separately. One (type) is when contrary items are compared to one another. ...¹ This same type can be applied in the case of one person ...¹ There is, however, a (sub)type of this (type), which in the same sentence introduces what is contrary to an earlier word and is usually combined with it. ...¹ Another type is that which is added likewise to a former expression, but now as a consequence (of what was expressed before), as did Demetrius of Phalerum: “To us the immortal gods gave the fruits of the earth first; what we alone received, we distributed all over the world. To us our forebears left a state; and it is also we who liberated our allies from servitude. As a result we are held in the highest honor by all, and because of the dignity of this honor no one experiences a trace of our haughtiness.”²

¹ Rutilius cites instances from Charisius, Dinarchus and Isidorus respectively.

² I.e., “because we are worthy of this honour no one experiences a trace of arrogance in our behavior”?

- 129** Rutilius Lupus, *On Figures* 1.1 (5.1–4; 9–14 Brooks)

ADDED ACCOUNT (*prosapodosis*)

This figure can be effected and handled in two ways. That is to say, when two or more propositions have been put forth, the argument for each will either be given later or will be attached immediately to each proposition. The cases where the argument is

186 W

sunt. . . . cum singulis sententiis statim ratio subiungitur, hoc exemplo. Demetrii Phalerei: Nam quod beneficium tempore et cupienti datur, gratum est; utilitas enim ac voluntas accipiendi honorem dantis facit ampliorem. at quod sero et non desideranti datur, ingratum est; amisso enim tempore 10 utilitatis cadit accipiendi cupiditas.

1 PROSAPODOSIS] *cf. Auct. ad Her. 4.40.52; Quint. Inst. 9.394–5; Carmen de Figuris 112–14*

9 dantis facit *R, A (corr. ex facis): dantis facis BV; dati facit ed. Basil.* 10 desideranti datur *ed. Basil.: desideranti dari datur C*

Genera Causarum

130 Philodemus, *De Rhetorica* IV, *PHerc.* 1007, col. 40a.24–42a.4 (BT 1.221–2 Sudhaus)

περὶ μ[έ]ντο[ι]
 25 τοῦ χρησιμεύειν τι τοῖς
 ἐ[νκω]μιαζομένοις
 41a καὶ ψεγομένοις
 ἢ τ[οῖ]ς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις διαμ-
 φισβητήσομεν οὐδένα θεω-
 ροῦντες ἐπανορθούμενον
 5 δι' αὐτῶν οὐδ' ἐπινοοῦντες
 157 W <π>ῶς ἂν δύναιντο. καὶ μὴν ὁ
 Δη[μ]ήτριος μετὰ τοῦ σοφισ-
 τ[ικο]ῦ γένους τῶν λόγων
 προστιθεὶς τῶι δημηγορι-
 10 κῶι καὶ δίκανικῶι τὸν ἐν-
 τευκτικὸν ἅπασιν, εἰ μὲν
 λαμβάνει τὸν τοῖς πλήθε-
 σιν ἐντευκτικὸν καὶ τὸν
 κατὰ πρεσβείαν τοῖς δυνάσ-
 15 ταις, ἐχέτω μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ
 παρόντος· ὃ γὰρ ἐκ τούτων
 ἀγαθὸν γίνεται, μετὰ ταῦ-
 τα ἀποψόμεθα· διότι
 δὲ ταῦτοῦ 'καὶ' ταῦτα καὶ τὸ

added later, are of the following kind. ...¹ When the argument is attached immediately to the individual propositions, (we get cases like) this example. From Demetrius of Phalerum: "For a service rendered in time and where desired, is welcome; for its usefulness and the will to accept it redound to the greater honor of the benefactor. But a service rendered (too) late and where it is not wanted, is unwelcome; for, the moment of its usefulness having been missed, the desire to accept it vanishes."

¹ Rutilius cites an instance from Demosthenes.

Genres of Speeches

- 130** Philodemus, *On Rhetoric* IV, *PHerc.* 1007, col. 40a.24–42a.4 (*BT* 1.221–2 Sudhaus)

41a As for their (the sophistic kind of speeches) being of any use, however, to the persons who are being praised and criticized or to other people, we will call that into question, since we do not observe anybody being corrected through them, nor (can) conceive how they could (have that effect).

Another point is that Demetrius of Phalerum, along with the sophistic (= epideictic) kind of speeches, adds to the deliberative and forensic (kinds) the (kind of speech) serving for encounters with all people. Now, if he takes (this) as the (kind of speech) serving for encounters with the masses and as that (serving for encounters) with rulers in diplomatic missions, let us grant him that for the moment. For later we shall see what good comes from them, though he must be said also to be making a mistake insofar

- 20 σοφιστικὸν εἶδος ἐποίη-
 σεν, λεγέσθ' ὥς αἰ διαμαρτά-
 νειν. εἰ δὲ τὸν περὶ τῆς ὁ-
 μεῖλίας λόγον ἴδιον ἡμῶν
 ὄντα καὶ ποικίλως ἐπιδει-
 25 κνύμενον τῶν φιλοσό-
 φων ἀφαιρούμενος τοῖς
 ῥητορικοῖς ἀνατίθῃσι, τὴν
 ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἐαυ-
 42a τοῦ ποτε γενομένην ἐξου-
 σίαν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς ὅς κέψῃς με-
 τάγει τὰς πίστεως δεομέ-
 νας.

41a 6–42a 4 = 228 F 15 FG^{rh} 41a 28–42a 3 cf. 119.8–13; 57.13–
 21; 121.1–6

40a 24. 26 Spengel 41a 6–9 Spengel (9: προ[στιθεῖς]) 21
 λεγέσθ' ὥς αἰ legit Dorandi: λεγέσθαι edd. 22–3 ὁμιλίας]
 ΑΙΜΕΛΙΑC A primo in O correcto pap.: ὁμειλίας = ὁμιλίας Dorandi:
 ἀληθείας Spengel (ἀληθείας), Sudhaus

Oratores versus philosophos

- 131A Philodemus, *De Rhetorica*, PHerc. 1004, col. 55.3–16 (BT
 1.350 Sudhaus)

- 158 W αρξα . [.]ε[.]να[
 δύνασθαι σιωπᾶν, ὥς
 5 παρὰ Ξενοκράτει, μο-
 νωτάτους καὶ λέγειν
 εἰδέναι—ταῦτοῦ γὰρ ἐ-
 κάτερον εἶναι—τίνι προσ-
 έχοντες [τ]ί πρὸς θεῶν
 10 πιστεύσομεν, εἰ μὴ τῷ
 Ξενοκράτην οὕτως
 ἐπ' Ἀντιπάτρου καὶ τῶν
 συνέδρων διαλεχθῇ-
 να[ι, καθά]π[ερ ὁ] Φαληρεὺς

as he attributed both these and the sophistic (epideictic) kind to one and the same person.

42a But if he takes away from the philosophers the (kind of) speech which concerns the (philosophical) conversation, being particular to us and exhibited in various ways, and assigns it to the rhetoricians, then he transfers the license that once was his in political matters, also into the realm of inquiries that require proof.¹

¹ I.e., he abuses his authority in these matters as much as he did in politics. On this fragment cp. T. Dorandi, *Festschrift W. Kullmann*, 1997, 274–6.

Orators *versus* Philosophers

131A Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 55.3–16 (*BT* 1.350 Sudhaus)

...(as for the fact that those who have?) the ability to keep silent, as (we find) in Xenocrates, are absolutely the only ones who also know how to speak—for either (capacity) belongs to one and the same person—what proof do we need, what in the name of (the) gods, to believe (that), but the fact that Xenocrates has spoken in this manner before Antipater and his councillors, as the

15

]ωι πο
]αλλον

2–16 228 F 48a FGrH = Xenocrates F 37 Isnardi = Diog. Bab. F 103 SVF III 238 von Arnim; cf. W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, 1906, 67 10–14 cf. 12 11 Ξενοκράτην] cf. 49

1–2 P vacat 2–3 ὑπ]άρξα[ι Ἀ]θ[η]να[ίοις τό τε] Sudhaus: τὸ δὲ τοὺς] ἰ]άρξα[μ]έ[νους] ἀ[πὸ τοῦ von Arnim, Croenert 9 [τ]ί πρὸς θεῶν Sudhaus: ὧ πρὸς θεῶν von Arnim, Croenert 15–16 [ιστόρηκεν ἐν τ]ῷ πελ[ρὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς Sudhaus, von Arnim, Wehrli, Jacoby: σο[φιστῆς ἐν τ]ῷ Πολ[ιτικῷ φησι; μ]ᾶλλον ἢ [δὲ Croenert

131B Philodemus, *De Rhetorica*, PHerc. 453, fr. 4.1–16 (p. 67 Crönert)

159 W

- 4 νυνεὶ καὶ δημηγοροῦ-
σιν οὐ ῥήτορες μόνον
ἀλλὰ καὶ φιλόσοφοι, φο-
βοῦμαι δὲ μὴ καὶ πλείου[ς
5 ἐκείνων οὗτοι. καὶ γὰρ
οἴους οἴονται κα[ὶ] ἀρ[ι-
θμοῦσιν ὡς ῥήτορας, [ἔ-
νιοι φιλοσόφους ἀποφ[αί-
νουσιν. Ξενοκράτης
10 δ', εἴπερ ἀληθεύει Δημή-
τριος, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ῥή-
τ]ωρ εἶναι καὶ Θεοφράσ-
του γν]ώριμος [.]ατε
ψεύδεται αὐτοῦ φ[ανερ]όν,
15 ἐπὶ τε τοῦ παρ' Ἀντιπά-
[τρ]ωι συνε]δρίου κατη[γο-

1–16 = Xenocrates F 39 Isnardi; cf. W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, 1906, 67–8; D. Bassi, RFIC 38 (1910) 344–5 9–16 228 F 48b FGrH 12–13 cf. Thphr. no. 18.5 FHS&G

papyrus deperdita est. superest nil nisi apographum Neapolitanum (N). 1–16 Croenert 1 νυνεὶ] α supra ve scriptum est: νῦν ἀεὶ an νῦν δὲ? Croenert || ΔΗΜΟΓΟΡΟΥ Ν 12–14 verba corrupta sunt: καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ῥή[τ]ωρ εἶναι (δημηγορῶν οὐ κατώρθωσεν) ἐπὶ τε τοῦ κτλ. e.g. Croenert, qui (ὅτι δὲ ὁ) Θεοφράσ[του γν]ώριμος [κατα]ψεύδεται αὐτοῦ φ[ανερ]όν glossam in margine fuisse suspicatur 13 [.]ατε[→

Phalerean (says) in his ...¹

¹ On Xenocrates' role in the embassy to Antipater see e.g. R. Whitehead, *RhM* 124 (1981) 238–41; M. Isnardi Parente, *RFIC* 109 (1981) 137–8; 150–3; and T. Dorandi, 'Senocrate nel giudizio di Demetrio del Falero,' in: *Beiträge zur antiken Philosophie. Festschrift für W. Kullmann*, 1997, 271–8.

131B Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 453, fr. 4.1–16 (p. 67 Crönert)

- 4 Actually, nowadays not only orators do speak in public, but philosophers too, and even more of the latter, I'm afraid, than of the former. No wonder, seeing that some people proclaim philosophers such persons as they think to be orators and reckon among the number of these. But Xenocrates, if indeed Demetrius is right, precisely because of his not being an orator and an acquaintance of Theophrastus stated an obvious falsehood about him,¹ and at the meeting of Antipater's council denounc...

¹ The text in ll. 12–14 appears to be corrupt. On the vexed question of their interpretation see W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, 1906, 68; A. Ievoli, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 3 (1973) 93–4; T. Dorandi, *Festschrift Kullmann*, 1997, 273–4.

Dorandi: ..λαε.. Croenert, Wehrli, Jacoby: ...λατε Bassi 16]δρίου Croenert:]δρίωι N

***131C** Philodemus, *De Rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 224, fr. 12.1–12 (BT 2.173 Sudhaus)

12]ν κεχειροτονημένους
[διαψη]φίσασθαι λέγειν αὐτὸν
[ἐν πρώ]τοις καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡλι-
[κίαν καὶ] `διά' τὴν περὶ τοὺς λό-
5 [γους ἄσκ]ησιν· τὸν δὲ Ξενο-
[κράτην, ὡς] εἰώθει διαπε-
[ραίνεσθαι] πρὸς θέσιν ἐν Ἀ-
[καμεδεΐαι], τὸν αὐτὸν τρό-
[πον]εσθαι καὶ το[
10]ν Ἀντίπα-
[τρ]ξαμε-
[]τως λέ-

1–12 = *Xenocrates F 38 Isnardi*; cf. W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, 1906, 67; M. Ferrario, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 13 (1983) 108–9 5–10 cf. Wehrli p. 80 ad F 158–9

papyrus deperdita est. superest nil nisi apographum Neapolitanum (N). 1 προσελόντας τὸν Ξενοκράτη πρὸς τοὺς εἰς τὴν πρεσβείαν]ν κεχειροτονημένους e.g. Croenert 2 Croenert:]ρισασθαι N 3 Croenert 4–9 Sudhaus 9–13 [διεξέρχ]εσθαι καὶ τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὸν Ἀντίπα[τρον ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, οὐ δε]ξαμέ[ινου δὲ ἀποτυχεῖν. οὗ]τως λέ[γεται καὶ Croenert, Wehrli 9]τεσθαι N 9–10 τὸ [σιωπᾶν καὶ λέγει]ν Sudhaus

132 Philodemus, *De Rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 48.1–15 (BT 1.346 Sudhaus)

156 W **48** εἶναι Φίλωνος, ὃ [Δημή-]
τριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν [τ]ῶι
περὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς ἔ-
ταξεν, ἴσως `τὰ πράγματα' ἄλλα'. κατ' αὐτοῦ
5 δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ θατέ[ρο]ν
Φίλωνος. ε[ἴ]τε γὰρ ὁ μᾶλ-
λον εἰδὼ[ς τῶν] εἰδό-
των μὲν . [...].αθ' ἦτ-
τον δ' ε[ἰδ]ότων ἀφείλ[ε]-
10 το τὴν ἐργολαβία[ν .±.]
ἀνασκε[υάσ]αι .. κοι ...

***131C** Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 224, fr. 12.1–12 (*BT* 2.173 Sudhaus)

12 that ... elected by show of hands (as ambassadors) they had decided that he (Xenocrates) was to be among the first to speak, both because of his age¹ and because of his practice in speaking. But that Xenocrates, as he was wont to argue a thesis thoroughly in the Academy, in the same way ... Antipa(ter) ...

¹ He must have been around 74 years old at the time of the embassy.

132 Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 48.1–15 (*BT* 1.346 Sudhaus)

48 ... that of Philo, as Demetrius of Phalerum in his *On Rhetoric* arranged, in like manner the facts were different. With respect to him also those concerning the other Philo. For whether the one who knows more took away the contract for the execution of work from those who know ... but know less ... refutation, the orator who has obtained the greatest experience ... shall ...

σει τὸν ὅλως ἄπειρ[ον]
 σοφὸν [τ]ῶν πολιτικῶν
 ὁ τὴν ἄκραν ἐσχηκὼ[ς]
 15 ῥήτωρ ἐμπ[ειρί]αν ...

1–15 228 F 47 FGrH = Diog. Bab. F 100 SVF III 237 von Arnim; cf. M.G. Cappelluzzo, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 6 (1976) 73 6 de Philone architectone cf. Phld. Rh. IV, col. 11a (1.192 Sudhaus); Cic. De Or. 1.14.62; Val. Max. 8.12 ext. 2; 54.4–5

1 ὁ von Arnim, ὁ Sudhaus || [Δημή]τριος Sudhaus 4 'τὰ πράγματ' ἄλλα'. κατ' αὐτοῦ von Arnim: 'τὰ πράγματ' ἄλλ[ως]' · κατ' αὐτοῦ Sudhaus 5 Sudhaus 8 von Arnim, [πράγμ]αθ' Sudhaus 9–10 von Arnim, ἀφειδ[ῶς] | τὸ Sudhaus 10 τῶι von Arnim (hiatus!) 12. 15 Sudhaus

Elocutio

133 Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum* 1.15–2.2; 2.6 (CB 5.82.5–83.5; 84.2–13 Aujac)

15 ἔπειτ' οὐδὲ μόνος οὐδὲ πρῶτος ἐπιφανήσομαι περὶ Πλάτωνος ἐπιχειρήσας τι λέγειν · οὐδ' ἂν τις ἔχοι κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο μέμψασθαί με τὸ μέρος, ὅτι τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τῶν φιλοσόφων καὶ πλείοσιν ἢ δώδεκα γενεαῖς ἐμαυτοῦ πρεσβύτερον ἐξετάζειν *** ἐπεβαλόμην ὥς δὴ 5
 16 διὰ τοῦτο δόξης τινὸς τευξόμενος. πολλοὶ γὰρ εὗρεθήσονται πρὸ ἐμοῦ τοῦτο πεποιηκότες, οἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνου γενόμενοι χρόνον, οἱ δὲ λίαν ὕστερον ἐπακμάσαντες · καὶ γὰρ τὰ δόγματα διέβαλον αὐτοῦ τινες καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἐμέμψαντο πρῶτον μὲν ὁ γνησιώτατος αὐτοῦ 10 μαθητὴς Ἀριστοτέλης, ἔπειτα οἱ περὶ Κηφισόδωρόν τε καὶ Θεόπομπον καὶ Ζωΐλον καὶ Ἴπποδάμαντα καὶ Δημήτριον καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοί, οὐ διὰ φθόνον ἢ διὰ φιλαπεχθημοσύνην κωμωδοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν
 17 ἐξετάζοντες. τοσούτοις δὴ καὶ τηλικούτοις ἀνδράσι 15 παραδείγμασι χρώμενος καὶ παρὰ πάντας τῷ μεγίστῳ Πλάτωνι, οὐδὲν ἡγούμην τῆς φιλοσόφου ῥητορικῆς ποιεῖν ἀλλότριον ἀγαθοὺς ἀγαθοῖς ἀντεξετάζων.
 περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς προαιρέσεως ἦν ἔσχον ἐν τῇ συγκρίσει τῶν χαρακτήρων, ἱκανῶς ἀπολελόγισμαι καὶ σοί, 20

the wise man who is wholly inexperienced in political matters ...

Expression

- 133** Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* 1.15–2.2; 2.6 (CB 5.82.5–83.5; 84.2–13 Aujac)

15 Furthermore, it will be seen that I am by no means the only, nor
even the first critic who has ventured to express an opinion about
Plato. Nor could anyone find fault with me on the particular
ground that I have taken it upon myself *** to examine the most
distinguished of philosophers, who is my senior by more than
twelve generations, in the hope of winning a name for myself in
16 this way, because many will be found to have done so before me,
some of them his contemporaries, others flourishing at a much
later time. For after all there are men who have attacked his doc-
trines and criticized his dialogues: in the first place the man who
was most truly his pupil, Aristotle, next Cephisodorus, Theopom-
pus, Zoilus, Hippodamas, Demetrius and their colleagues, and
many others, not making fun (of him) out of envy or quarrelsomeness,
but in an attempt to arrive at the truth through a process of
17 critical examination. So with the example of so many men of that
stature before me, and especially that of the greatest of all, Plato, I
thought I was doing nothing alien to the spirit of philosophic
rhetoric in comparing good writers with (other) good writers.

Now, as to the principle which I have adopted in comparing
the characteristics of style, I have sufficiently accounted for it,
even to your satisfaction, my dearest Geminus.

Γεμῖνε φίλτατε.

- 2 λοιπὸν δ' ἐστὶ μοι καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ὧν εἴρηκα λόγων
περὶ τάνδρὸς ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν πραγματεία
ῥητόρων εἰπεῖν. θήσω δὲ αὐταῖς λέξεσιν, ὥς ἐκεῖ
γέγραφα. 25

- 2 “ἡ δὲ δὴ Πλατωνικὴ διάλεκτος βούλεται μὲν εἶναι
καὶ αὐτὴ δεῖγμα ἑκατέρου τῶν χαρακτήρων, τοῦ τε
ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἰσχυροῦ, καθάπερ εἴρηταί μοι πρότερον·
πέφυκε δ' οὐχ ὁμοίως πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς χαρακτῆρας
6 εὐτυχής. ... μάλιστα δὲ χειμάζεται περὶ τὴν τροπικὴν 30
φράσιν· πολλὴ μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις, ἄκαιρος δ' ἐν
ταῖς μετωνυμίαις, σκληρὰ δὲ καὶ οὐ σώζουσα τὴν
ἀναλογίαν ἐν ταῖς μεταφοραῖς γίγνεται· ἀλληγορίας τε
περιβάλλεται μακρὰς καὶ πολλὰς, οὔτε μέτρον ἐχούσας
170 W οὔτε καιρόν· σχήμασί τε ποιητικοῖς ἐσχάτην προσ- 35
βάλλουσιν ἀηδίαν, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς Γοργιεῖσι
ἀκαίρως καὶ μεираκιωδῶς ἐναβρύνεται. καὶ ‘πολὺς ὁ
τελέτης ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις παρ' αὐτῷ,’ ὥς καὶ
Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς εἴρηκέ που καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοί· ‘οὐ
γὰρ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος’.” 40

9–13 228 F 11a FGrH 11 Κηφισόδωρον] cf. FHG II 85 et 112
FGrH 12 Θεόπομπον] cf. D.H. Pomp. 6 (= 115 F 20a FGrH) ||
Ζωΐλον] cf. D.H. Pomp. 1.4; FHG II 85; 71 FGrH 26–40 = D. H.
Dem. 5.1; 5–6 (CB 2.54.20–3; 56.1–10 Aujac) [= Dem.] 30–40 228
F 11b FGrH 39–40 οὐ γὰρ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος] Eur. F 484.1 N.² = F 667
Mette, *Lustrum* 12 (1967) 170

1 οὐδὲ] οὐ Herwerden 5 post ἐξετάζειν lac. 17 litt. habent AIV:
βουλ-ηθείς, ἐκείνῳ add. Aujac 21 Γεμῖνε Wilamowitz: γε ἡμῖν
codd. 27 δεῖγμα] μῖγμα Dem. || ἑκατέρου] ἑκατέρων Dem. 31 μὲν
γὰρ] μὲν Dem. 32 μετωνυμίαις Dem.: ἐπωνυμίαις codd. 33 με →

Actio

- 134 Philodemus, *De Rhetorica* IV, PHerc. 1007, col. 15a.20–
18a.8 (BT 1.197–200 Sudhaus)

- 20 οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτῳι
[δὴ κ]αίπερ ἐν τοῖς δεινο[τά]-
τοις ὄντι φωνὴν ὀξεῖ[α]ν

2 It now remains for me to refer to the actual remarks I have made on the man (Plato) in my treatise on the Attic Orators.¹ I will quote them *verbatim* as I have written them there:

2 “Plato’s style, as much as (that of Isocrates), is intended to be a sample of each of the styles, the sublime and the plain, as I have said before, but its inherent qualities prevent it from being equally
6 successful with regard to both styles. ...² In figurative speech it suffers most: it is abundant in its (use of) appositions, inopportune in its (use of) metonymies, harsh and failing to preserve analogy in its (use of) metaphors; it encompasses many long allegories, which are ill-proportioned and ill-timed; and it revels inappropriately and in a juvenile manner in (the use of) poetical figures, especially the Gorgianic figures, which arouse utter displeasure. Indeed, ‘in matters like these there is a lot of the Hierophant in him,’ as both Demetrius of Phalerum has said somewhere, and also several others; ‘for the story is not mine’.”

¹ Dionysius quotes from his essay *On the Style of Demosthenes*, section 5.

² In this part Dionysius first discusses Plato’s use of the plain style and then of the sublime style.

ταφοραῖς γίνεται] *lac. fere 10 litt. Dem. AIBT*: μεταλλαγαῖς in *lac. Dem. V* 34 μακρὰς καὶ πολλὰς] πολλὰς *et lac. fere 8 litt. Dem.* 37–8 πολὺς ὁ τελέτης] πολυτέλειά τις *Dem.* 38 τελετῆς *codd.*: *corr. Usener, cf. E. Fraenkel, Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis II, 1912, 202–3* || ἐστὶν *om. Dem.* 39 πρότερον *post* συχνοί *Dem.*

Delivery

134 Philodemus, *On Rhetoric* IV, *PHerc.* 1007, col. 15a.20–18a.8 (*BT* 1.197–200 Sudhaus)

It is nevertheless true that Aeschines criticizes even him (Demosthenes), although he is one of the most forceful (orators), for his shrill and sometimes (too) loud voice. In the Phalerean the

- Αἰσχίνης ὄνειδίζει, πο[τ]ῆ
 162 W δὲ κ[αὶ μ]ακράν· παρὰ δὲ [τῶ]ι
 25 Φάληρεϊ λέγεται τὸ ὕτο· “ποι-
 κίλον μὲν αὐτὸν ὑποκρ[ι]-
 16a τὴν γεγονέναι καὶ περιττόν,
 οὐχ ἀπλοῦν δὲ οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸν
 γενναῖον τρόπον, ἀλλ’ ἐῖς τὸ
 μαλακώτερον καὶ ταπεινό-
 5 τερον ἀποκλεί[νον]τα.” οἱ
 δ’ οὖν πολλοὶ τ[ῶν] σοφιστῶν
 εἰκότασιν, ἐξ ὧν γεγράφα-
 σιν, ἀθλίως ὑποκεκρίσ[θ]αι·
 169 W πονηρὸν γὰρ εἰς ὑπόκρι-
 10 σιν αἱ μ[α]κρὰὶ περίοδοι, κα-
 θάπερ καὶ παρὰ Δημητρί-
 ωι κεῖται περὶ τῶν Ἰσοκρά-
τους. Ἱερών[υμο]ς δὲ φη-
 σιν ἀναγνῶνα[ι μ]ὲν αὐ-
 15 τοῦ τοὺς λόγου[ς] καλῶς
 δυνήσεσθαι τιν[α], δη[μ]η-
 γορῆσαι δὲ τὴν τε φ[ω]νὴν
 καὶ τὸν τόνον ἐπαίρον-
 τα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ κατ[α]-
 20 σκευῇ[ι μετ]ὰ τ[ῇ] ἁρμοττο[ύ]-
 σης ὑποκρίσεως εἰπεῖν
 οὐ παντελῶς· τὸ γὰρ μέ-
 [γι]στον καὶ κεινητικώ-
 τατον παρεῖσθαι τῶν
 25 ὄχλων—ἄψυχον γὰρ αὐτοῦ
 καὶ ἀνυπάκο[υσ]τ[ο]ν εἶναι
 17a τὴν λέξιν καὶ οἶονεῖ πρ[ὸς ἔ]να
 τόνον πεποιημένην—τὸ δὲ
 κεκλασμένον καὶ παντο-
 δα[πὸ]ν καὶ ἐπιτάσει τε καὶ
 5 ἀνέσει καὶ ταῖς παθητικαῖς
 ὑπερθέ[σ]εσιν διειλ[ημ]μέ-
 νον ἀπο[β]εβληκέναι, τῇ [δ]ὲ
 λειότητι διὰ παντὸς
 δουλεύειν. τοιγα[ρο]ῦν ἐ[ύ]-

- 16a following is read: "He (Demosthenes) was an actor (whose delivery) was full of changes and extravagant, not simple nor in the noble style, but inclining to the feeble and lowly side."

As a matter of fact, most of the sophists appear, from what they have written, to have been dismal in delivery; the reason is that long periods are a bad thing for a good delivery, an observation one may also find in Demetrius about the (periods) of Isocrates.

- 17a Hieronymus says that a person will be able to read his (Isocrates) speeches quite nicely, but not at all to declaim them in public with a raising of the volume and pitch of the voice and to speak in that performance (of live oratory) with the appropriate delivery. For what is most important and most likely to move the masses has been neglected (by Isocrates). The reason is that his style is soulless and not suitable for being listened to and as it were made in one pitch, and that it has thrown away the modulation and variety and the diversification through tension and relaxation (of the pitch) and through the emotional climaxes, and is subservient to smoothness throughout. Therefore, it can be read well with subdued voice, but not with lifted voice, [because ... and] because by its (rhetorical) periods it even chokes the speaker,

- 10 ἀνάγνωστον μὲν εἶναι [τ]ῆς
 φων[ῆς] ὑφειμένης, ἐπα[ρ]-
 θείσης δὲ αν ταῖς πε-
 ρι[ό]δ[ο]ις καὶ π[ν]εῖγουσαν τὸ[ν]
 λέγοντα, καὶ τὴν ὑπόκρι-
 15 σιν ἀφαιρου[μ]ένου, καὶ σχε-
 δὸν ἐναντίαν τῇ τῶν πο-
 λειτικῶν, [τὸ]ν δὲ πολειτευ-
 ομένων ἐπιστατήσοντα
 πολειτικὴν δεῖν καὶ δημη-
 20 γορικὴν κα[τά]κεχύσθαι
 λέξιν καὶ μὴ τὴν ἐπιδί-
 φριον καὶ καταψιθυρίζου-
 σαν τὸν λόγον. ὅμοιον
 γοῦν εἶναι τῷ δασὺ καὶ
 25 μέγα περιθέμενον πρό-
 σωπο[ν] παιδίου φωνὴν ἀ-
 φιέν[αι καὶ] τὸ τοῖς Ἑλ-
 18a λ[ησ]ιν συμβουλεύοντα καὶ
 πλάσμα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην κα-
 τασκευὴν δημηγόρου πε-
 ριβαλλόμενον ἐπ' ἀ[ναγ]νώσ-
 5 του παιδὸς φωνὴν ἀπο-
 [δεδ]ρακέναι μήτε τόνον
 [μ]ήτε πάθος μήθ' ὑπόκρι-
 σιν δυναμένου φέρειν.

15a 20-4 cf. *Aeschin. Or.* 2.157; 106; 86; 3.218 15a 24-16a 5 228
F 18b FGrH 16a 2-5 cf. 137.20-3 9-13 228 *F 14 FGrH* 10
 μ[α]κραὶ περίοδοι] cf. *Arist. Rh.* 3.9 1409b17-32 16a 9-18a 8
Hieronimus F 52a Wehrli; cf. *G. Indelli, Cronache Ercolanesi* 23 (1993)
 88-90; *M. Gigante, Beiträge zur antiken Philosophie. Festschrift für W.*
Kullmann, 1997, 260-3 16a 13-17a 7 *D.H. Isoc.* 13.3-4 (*CB*
1.130.20-131.3 Aujac) 18a 4-8 *D.H. Isoc.* 13.5 (*CB 1.131.3-5 Aujac*)

15a 21 *Sudhaus* 25 *Gros* (τοῦτο) 16a 15 καλῶς *Spengel* 26
 ἀνυπάκο[υσ]τ[ο]ν *Scotti* 17a 12 in papyro: 1 M (N?) 2 E/O 3-4 ΔΙ
 vel ΛΙ vel Ν (ΑΙ?) 5 ? 6 Put videtur || δὲ μ[ή, λί]αν *Sudhaus*: δὲ μ[ή, λί]αν,
Indelli 13 καὶ π[ν]εῖγουσαν *Indelli*: κα[τεπ]εῖ[γ]ουσιν
Sudhaus 15 ἀφαιρου[μ]ένου *Sudhaus*: ἀφαιρου[μ]ένην *manvult*
Spengel cetera *Spengel*

and, the speaker being deprived of delivery, is just about the opposite of the (style that is required) in political speeches, whereas the person who is going to be a leader in politics has to be steeped in a style suited to politics and public speaking and not in a style which belongs to every day life and ruins the speech by whispering. At least, imagine a person endowing himself with a shaggy and great mask and then emitting the voice of a child: quite comparable is the situation of one (as Isocrates) who in tendering advice to the Greeks and in using the formality in style and the rest of the rhetorical technique of a public speaker, has recourse to the voice of a professional reader, who is not capable of producing the pitch nor the emotion nor the delivery (needed on the occasion).

135A Plutarchus, *Demosthenes* 9.1–4 (BT 1.2.288.5–7; 288.17–289.4 Ziegler)

- 1 πόθεν οὖν, φαίη τις ἄν, ὁ Αἰσχίνης πρὸς τὴν ἐν τοῖς
 λόγοις τόλμαν θαυμασιώτατον ἀπεκάλει τὸν ἄνδρα; ...
 2 ἀλλ' ἔοικεν ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ Περικλέους τὰ μὲν ἄλλα μὴ πρὸς
 αὐτὸν ἡγήσασθαι, τὸ δὲ πλάσμα καὶ τὸν σχηματισμὸν
 αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ μὴ ταχέως μηδὲ περὶ παντὸς ἐκ τοῦ 5
 παρισταμένου λέγειν, ὥσπερ ἐκ τούτων μεγάλου
 γεγονότος, ζηλῶν καὶ μιμούμενος, οὐ πάνυ προσίεσθαι
 τὴν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ δόξαν, οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῇ τύχῃ πολλάκις ἐκὼν
 163 W 3 εἶναι ποιεῖσθαι τὴν δύναμιν. ἐπεὶ τόλμαν γε καὶ θάρσος
 οἱ λεχθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι τῶν γραφέντων μᾶλλον 10
 εἶχον, εἴ τι δεῖ πιστεύειν Ἐρατοσθένει καὶ Δημητρίῳ τῷ
 4 Φαληρεῖ καὶ τοῖς κωμικοῖς. ὧν Ἐρατοσθένης μὲν φησιν
 αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις πολλαχοῦ γεγονέναι παράβακχον,
 ὁ δὲ Φαληρεὺς τὸν ἔμμετρον ἐκεῖνον ὄρκον ὁμόσαι ποτὲ
 πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ὥσπερ ἐνθουσιῶντα· “μὰ γῆν, μὰ 15
 κρήνας, μὰ ποταμούς, μὰ νάματα.”

1–2 πρὸς—θαυμασιώτατον] *Aeschin. Or.* 3.152; cf. *Alex. Fig.* 19
 (*RhGr* 3.36 *Spengel*) 9–16 228 *F* 16 *FGrH* 9–14 *Eratosth.* 241
F 32 *FGrH* 12 τοῖς κωμικοῖς] cf. e.g. *Adespota F* 149.3 *PCG K.-A.*
 15–16 *Antiph. F* 288 = *Timocl. F* 41 *PCG K.-A.*; cf. [*Plu.*] *Vitae*
X or. 845D; *schol. Ar. Aves* 194c = *Suda* μ 12

2 ἀποκαλεῖ *N* 3 ἄλλα καλὰ *N* 6 προισταμένου *N* 7
 προσίεσθαι *Lambinus*: προίεσθαι *codd.* 14 ὁμοσέ ποτε *N* 15–16
schol. Ar. μὰ κρήνας, μὰ γῆν, μὰ ποταμούς

135B Photius, *Bibliotheca* 265 493a42–b16 (CB 8.63.19–64.8 Henry)

- 164 W b ἐπεὶ δέ ποτε δημηγορῶν ἐξέπεσε τοῦ θεάτρου καὶ
 ἀθυμῶν οἴκαδε ἀπῆει, Εὐνόμος μὲν αὐτῷ ὁ Θριάσιος ἤδη
 πρεσβύτερος ὢν κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν συνεκύρησε, καὶ μαθὼν
 τῆς ἀθυμίας τὸ αἷτιον θαρρεῖν τε προὔτρεψατο καὶ ἀνε-
 κτήσατο· καὶ τούτου πλέον Ἀνδρόνικος ὁ ὑποκριτής, 5
 τοὺς μὲν λόγους εὖ ἔχειν καὶ ὡς ἄριστα φάμενος, ἐνδεῖν
 δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ τῆς ὑποκρίσεως. ὁ δὲ παραδίδωσί τε ἑαυτὸν
 τῷ Ἀνδρονίκῳ, καὶ τὴν τῆς ὑποκρίσεως τέχνην ἐκεῖθεν

135A Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 9.1–4 (BT 1.2.288.5–7; 288.17–289.4 Ziegler)

- 1 How then is one to explain, someone might say, the fact that
 2 Aeschines called the man (Demosthenes) an absolute marvel in
 3 respect to the daring in his speeches? ...¹ On the other hand, to all
 4 appearances the man, while considering Pericles' other qualities
 not suited to himself, did admire and imitate his style and bearing,
 and his avoidance of speaking extempore and without preparation
 on any subject—these qualities to his mind being the cause of
 (Pericles') greatness—and he did not seek at all the reputation
 won in the heat of the moment, nor did he often of his own free
 will stake his influence upon a chance success. Still the speeches
 he spoke had more daring and boldness than the ones he wrote, if
 one is to put any faith in Eratosthenes, Demetrius of Phalerum
 and the comic poets. Of these (authorities), Eratosthenes says that
 in many places in his speeches he was near to ecstasy; and
 Demetrius says that he once swore before the people as if in a rap-
 ture the well-known metrical oath “By the earth, by the springs,
 by the rivers, by the streams.”

¹ Here Plutarch refers to Demosthenes' open opposition against Philip and those who promoted Philip's case, in his political speeches.

135B Photius, *Library* 265 493a42–b16 (CB 8.63.19–64.8 Henry)

- b Once he (Demosthenes) was on his way home, feeling dis-
 heartened, because he had been driven out of the theatre while
 speaking in public. Eunomus of Thria, at that time already an eld-
 erly man, met him in the street, and learning the cause of his de-
 spendency, urged him to take heart and restored his spirits. Even
 more so did Andronicus the actor, saying that his words were all
 right, yes even quite good, but that they were lacking in the ele-
 ment of delivery. He (Demosthenes) placed himself in the hands
 of Andronicus and from that moment practiced the art of delivery.

ἐξήσκησε. διόπερ ἐρομένου ποτέ τινος αὐτὸν τί πρῶτον
 ἐν ῥητορικῇ, ἀνείπεν ὑπόκρισις· καὶ τί δεύτερον; 10
 ὑπόκρισις· τί δὲ τρίτον; ὑπόκρισις· δηλῶν μέγα μέρος
 εἶναι τῆς ἐν τῷ δήμῳ πειθοῦς τὴν ὑπόκρισιν. ὦμνυ δέ, ὡς
 ὁ Φαληρεύς φησι, “Μὰ γῆν, μὰ κρήνας, μὰ ποταμούς, μὰ
 νάματα.” καὶ δὴ καί ποτε ὁμόσας τοὺς ὅρκους τούτους
 τῷ δήμῳ θόρυβον ἐνεποίησεν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμνύναι 15
 τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν, χρώμενος τῇ φωνῇ προπαροξυτόνως.

1–16 *similiter* [Plu.] *Vitae X or.* 845A–B (5.2.1.31.21–32.11 Mau), *sine*
mentionem Demetrii 2 Εὐνομος] *cf.* Plu. Dem. 6.5 5 Ἀνδρόνικος]
cf. Plu. Dem. 7.1–5, *ubi Satyrus legitur* 9–11 τί πρῶτον—ὑπόκρισις]
cf. Phld. Rh. IV, PHerc. 1007, col. 15a.3–6 (1.196 Sudhaus) 11–12
verba δηλῶν—ὑπόκρισιν desunt in [Plu.] et Photio attribuenda esse →
videntur

***135C** *Papiri della Società Italiana* 2.144.1–19 (PSI 2.70–1 Vitelli)

ὑπότραυ[λος ὦν καὶ τὸν ὦ]-
 μον μαλ[ακῶς κινῶν, γυμνα]-
 ζόμενος [δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Δη]-
 μοσθένη[ς κατῶρθωσε. καὶ]
 5 ἐν τοῖς δι[καστηρίοις ἤδη]
εὐημέρει
 δὲ τὸν προ[
 καὶ Ἐρατοσ[θένης δέ φη]-
 σι τὸν Δη[μοσθένην ὅρκον ὁ]-
 10 μωμοκέν[αι ἔμμετρον, παράβακ]-
 χον δ' ἐν π[ολλοῖς γεγονέναι]
 καὶ τὸν Ἀσκ[ληπιὸν εἰπεῖν]
 ἐπὶ τοῦ βήμ[ατος Ἀσκληπίον,]
 τὴν προσω[ιδίαν κακῶς μετα-]
 15 στρέφοντ[α καὶ παραδεικνύ]-
 μενον ὡς ἄ[ρα ἐστὶ λέγον]-
 τος ὀρθῶς· εἶ[ναι γὰρ τὸν]
 θεὸν ἥπιον· [καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ]
πίπτειν αἰ[κιζόμενον.]

1–19 *cf.* I. Gallo, *Frammenti Biografici da Papiri I*, 1975, 141–61; E.
 Drerup, *Demosthenes im Urteile des Altertums*, 1923, 48–9; 51–2 1–
 2 ὑπότραυ[λος—κινῶν] *cf.* [Plu.] *Vitae X or.* 844E 12–18 *similiter* →

That is the reason that, when someone once asked him “What comes first in rhetoric?,” he emphatically said, “Delivery.” “And what second?” “Delivery.” “And what third?” “Delivery.” Thus he made it clear that delivery is an important part of (the art of) persuasion in the popular assembly. According to the Phalerean, he used the oath, “By the earth, by the springs, by the rivers, by the streams.” In fact, once when he uttered this oath, he caused an uproar among the people, as he also did in swearing by Asclepius, using a pronunciation with the accent on the antepenultimate syllable.

3 πρεσβύτερος A: πρεσβύτης M || συνεκύρησε A: συνεκήρυσσε M 15 τῷ
A: τὸ M

***135C** *Papiri della Società Italiana* 2.144.1–19 (PSI 2.70–1 Vitelli)

Having a slight lisp and moving his shoulder in a feeble way, Demosthenes yet by practising corrected these defects. And in the jury courts he had success from that moment on ... and Eratosthenes says that Demosthenes once swore an oath in verse, and that he came near to ecstasy on many occasions and on the speaker’s platform called Asklepiós Asklēpios, changing the accentuation in a bad way and demonstrating that after all this pronunciation is correct, for the god is kind (*èpios*). And that because of that he fell in disgrace.¹

¹ The papyrus is much damaged and the supplements are very much *exempli gratia* and mainly based upon parallel texts.

[Plu.] *Vitae X or.* 845B–C; cf. *Eust. Il.* 4.204 (2.733.11–13 van der Valk); *Hdn. De prosodia* 3.1.123.1–4 Lentz

1 ὑπότραυ[λος *vel* ὑποτραυ[λίζων Vitelli: ὦν Gallo 1–3 καὶ—δὲ Drerup 2–
3 μαλ[ακι]ζόμενος Vitelli 3 ταῦτα Gallo: συχνῶς Drerup 3–4 ὁ Δη| ... [ς
Vitelli 4 κατώρθωσε Gallo: ἐπηνωρθοῦτο Drerup: οὐ ῥαδίως| Vitelli || καὶ
Drerup 5 δι[καστηρίοις]| Vitelli || ἤδη Gallo: μάλα Drerup 8 Vitelli 9–
10 Δη[μοσθένην ... ὁ]|μωμοκέν[αι Vitelli 9 ὄρκον Gallo: ποτὲ Drerup 10
ἔμμετρον Gallo: ἐν μέτρῳ Drerup || *fin.* Vitelli 11 Drerup 12 Vitelli: εἰπεῖν
Gallo: ὁμνύοντα Drerup 13 Vitelli 14 προσω[ιδίαν ... μετα-] Vitelli || κακῶς
Drerup *an* καλῶς *coll. Eust.?* 15 Gallo: ἀποφαινό|μενον Drerup 16 ἄ[ρα
ἐστὶ Drerup: α[ὐτοῦ Vitelli || λέγον]|τος Vitelli 17 Vitelli 18 Gallo: εἶτα
αὐτὸν ἐκ|πίπτειν Drerup (*hiatus!*) 19 Drerup

136 Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *De Demosthenis dictione* 53.1; 3–4 (CB 2.152.6–8; 18–27 Aujac)

- 1 εἷς ἔτι μοι καταλείπεται λόγος ὁ περὶ τῆς ὑποκρίσεως,
ὥς κεκόσμηκε τὴν λέξιν ἀνὴρ, ἀναγκαίᾳς ἀρετῆς οὕσης
περὶ λόγους καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς πολιτικούς. ...
- 3 ταύτης δὴ φημι τῆς ἀρετῆς πάνυ δεῖν τοῖς ἐναγωνίοις
λόγοις, εἰ μέλλουσιν ἔξιν πολὺ τὸ ἀληθινὸν καὶ 5
ἔμψυχον. ἥς πλείστην ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πρόνοιαν
165 W 4 ἔσχεν οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ. διττὴν δὲ τὴν φύσιν αὐτῆς οὖσαν
ὀρῶν, περὶ ἅμφω τὰ μέρη σφόδρα ἐσπούδασε. καὶ γὰρ τὰ
πάθη τὰ τῆς φωνῆς καὶ τὰ σχήματα τοῦ σώματος, ὥς
κράτιστα ἔξιν ἔμελλεν, οὐ μικρῷ πόνῳ κατειργάσατο, 10
καίτοι φύσει πρὸς ταῦτα οὐ πάνυ εὐτυχεῖ χρησάμενος,
ὥς Δημήτριός τε ὁ Φαληρεὺς φησι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες οἱ
τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ συγγράψαντες.

8–13 228 F 17b FGrH

9 σχήματα (τὰ) Usener-Radermacher || ὥς Sylburg: οἷς codd.

137 Plutarchus, *Demosthenes* 11.1–3 (BT 1.2.290.7–27 Ziegler)

- 166 W 1 τοῖς δὲ σωματικοῖς ἐλαττώμασι τοιαύτην ἐπῆγεν
ἄσκησιν, ὥς ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἱστορεῖ, λέγων
αὐτοῦ Δημοσθένους ἀκοῦσαι πρεσβύτου γεγονότος· τὴν
μὲν γὰρ ἀσάφειαν καὶ τραυλότητα τῆς γλώττης ἐκβιάζε-
σθαι καὶ διαρθροῦν εἰς τὸ στόμα ψήφους λαμβάνοντα 5
καὶ ῥήσεις ἅμα λέγοντα, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν γυμνάζειν ἐν τοῖς
δρόμοις καὶ ταῖς πρὸς τὰ σίμ' ἀναβάσεσι διαλεγόμενον
καὶ λόγους τινὰς ἢ στίχους ἅμα τῷ πνεύματι πυκνου-
μένῳ προφερόμενον· εἶναι δ' αὐτῷ μέγα κάτοπτρον
οἴκοι, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο τὰς μελέτας ἱστάμενον ἐξ ἐναντίας 10
περαίνειν.
- 2 λέγεται δ' ἀνθρώπου προσελθόντος αὐτῷ δεομένου
συνηγορίας καὶ διεξιόντος ὥς ὑπὸ τοῦ λάβοι πληγὰς,
“ἀλλὰ σύ γε,” φάναι τὸν Δημοσθένην, “τούτων ὧν λέγεις
οὐδὲν πέπονθας.” ἐπιτείναντος δὲ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ 15
ἀνθρώπου καὶ βοῶντος “ἐγὼ Δημόσθενης οὐδὲν πέ-

- 136** Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On the Style of Demosthenes* 53.1; 3–4 (CB 2.152.6–8; 18–27 Aujac)

1 There remains one topic for me to discuss, delivery—that is to say how the man (Demosthenes) embellished his style—this being an essential excellence of speeches and especially of political ones. ...¹

3 Now I maintain that this excellence is absolutely necessary for speeches in debate, if they are really to have the impact of truthfulness and vivacity. On this as on other subjects this man bestowed great care. He recognized its double nature and gave himself much trouble over its two parts: he ensured by no little effort that both the modulations of his voice and the postures of his body should be as effective as possible, even though his natural gifts were not entirely favourable to these ends, as is said by Demetrius of Phalerum and all his other biographers.

¹ Dionysius illustrates the importance of a good delivery by pointing out how in the theatre in reading their parts some actors please the audience, but others irritate it because they are thought to ruin the text by their reading.

- 137** Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 11.1–3 (BT 1.2.290.7–27 Ziegler)

1 To his physical shortcomings he (Demosthenes) applied the following training, according to the report of Demetrius of Phalerum, who claims to have heard Demosthenes himself in his old age. The lack of clarity and the lisping quality of his voice (Demosthenes) forcibly removed and transformed into articulation by taking pebbles into his mouth while reciting speeches. He trained his voice by talking while he was running or climbing slopes and by uttering clauses or verses all in one compressed breath. At home he had a large mirror before which he stood while going through his exercises.

2 There is a story about Demosthenes, that he was approached by a man asking him to help him plead in court. When the man explained how he had been beaten by someone, Demosthenes said “But you haven’t at all suffered what you say you have suffered.” The man raised his voice and screamed “Have I, Demosthenes, not at all suffered?!” and then Demosthenes said

3 πονθα;" "νή Δία" φάναι, "νῦν ἀκούω φωνήν ἀδικου-
 161 W μένου καὶ πεπονθότος." οὕτως ᾤετο μέγα πρὸς πίστιν
 εἶναι τὸν τόνον καὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν τῶν λεγόντων. τοῖς
 μὲν οὖν πολλοῖς ὑποκρινόμενος ἤρεσκε θαυμαστῶς, οἱ 20
 δὲ χαρίεντες ταπεινὸν ἡγοῦντο καὶ ἀγεννὲς αὐτοῦ τὸ
 πλάσμα καὶ μαλακόν, ὧν καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς
 ἐστίν.

1–11 228 F 17a FGrH 3–11 cf. [Plu.] Vitae X or. 844D–F 19–23
 228 F 18a FGrH 20–3 cf. 134.16a.2–5

1 ἐπήγαγεν N 3 ἀκούειν Y 4 γὰρ om. Y 6 γυμνάζειν N: γυμ-
 νάζεσθαι Y 7 πρὸς τὰ σιμὰ Y: πρὸς τάσιν U: πρὸς στάσιν N ||
 προβάσει Y

138 Cicero, *De Divinatione* 2.46.96 (BT 46.122.22–123.4 Giomini)

quid? illudne dubium est quin multi, cum ita nati essent,
 ut quaedam contra naturam depravata haberent, restitue-
 rentur et corrigerentur ab natura, cum se ipsa revocasset,
 aut arte atque medicina? ut, quorum linguae sic inhaerent,
 ut loqui non possent, eae scalpello resectae liberarentur. 5
 168 W multi etiam naturae vitium meditatione atque exercitatione
 sustulerunt, ut Demosthenem scribit Phalereus, cum rho
 dicere nequiret, exercitatione fecisse, ut planissime diceret.
 quodsi haec astro ingenerata et tradita essent, nulla res ea
 mutare posset. 10

7–10 cf. Plu. Dem. 6.4; Cic. De Or. 1.61.260–1; Quint. Inst. 1.11.5; Val.
 Max. 8.7 ext. 1

3 ab] aut Davies: aut ab Plasberg || ipse (corr. in -sa V)PV 4 ut] aut
 (ex ut B) codd. || inhaerent V || eae Manutius: hae codd. 8 fecisset BF

139 Q. Tullius Cicero, *Commentariolum Petitionis* 2–3 (BT 145.16–24 Shackleton Bailey)

nominis novitatem dicendi gloria maxime sublevabis.
 semper ea res plurimum dignitatis habuit; non potest qui
 dignus habetur patronus consularium indignus consulatu

- 3 “Oh yes, now I do hear the voice of someone who has been wronged and suffered.” This shows how important for persuasion he considered the pitch (of voice) and delivery to be of those who speak. The majority were wonderfully pleased with his delivery but connoisseurs, Demetrius of Phalerum among them, found his style base, ignoble and feeble.

138 Cicero, *On Divination* 2.46.96 (BT 46.122.22–123.4 Giomini)

Furthermore, can there be any doubt that many people, although they were born in such a way as to have certain abnormal defects, were healed and restored by nature, after she had regained herself, or by the art of medicine? For example, people who were tongue-tied to such a degree that they could not speak, had their tongue cut free by the scalpel. Many also have removed a defect of nature by sustained practice and exercise; thus the Phalerean writes that Demosthenes could not pronounce the rho, but through repeated practice learned to pronounce it with perfect clarity. Now, if these defects had been implanted and transmitted by a star, nothing could change them.

139 Q. Tullius Cicero, *Brief on the Canvass for the Consulship* 2–3 (BT 145.16–24 Shackleton Bailey)

You will take away the novelty of your name best by acquiring fame as a speaker.¹ That sphere of activity has always had the greatest dignity; one who is thought fit to be the advocate of men of consular rank, cannot be held unfit for the consulate. There-

putari. quam ob rem quoniam ab hac laude proficisceris et
quicquid es ex hoc es, ita paratus ad dicendum venito quasi 5
167 W 3 in singulis causis iudicium de omni ingenio futurum sit. eius
facultatis adiumenta, quae tibi scio esse seposita, ut parata
ac prompta sint cura, et saepe quae <de> Demosthenis stu-
dio et exercitatione scripsit Demetrius recordare.

6 de *add. Squarzafricanus*

Oratores Athenienses

cf. 155–6; 163–4

140 *Vita Aeschinis* 3.6–7 (BT 6.112–7 Dilts)

171 W 6 ὅτι μαθητῆς ἐγένετο, ὥς μὲν Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς
φησι, Σωκράτους τοῦ φιλοσόφου, εἶθ' ὕστερον Πλάτω-
7 νος· ὥς δὲ Καικίλιος καὶ Ἰδομενεὺς καὶ Ἑρμιππος
ἱστοροῦσιν, οὐκ ἤκουσε τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν μαθήσεως
χάριν. φασὶ γὰρ ὥς ὅτι οὐδὲν τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τοῦ 5
Πλατωνικοῦ σώζει,

1–6 228 F 30 FGrH = *Caec. Cal. F 126a Ofenloch* = *Idomeneus* 338 F
13 FGrH = *Hermipp. F 79 Wehrli* (cf. 163–4)

2 φησι *om. i* 3 Καικίλιος *Wolf*: κεκίλιος *Sfi* 4 ἱστοροῦσιν *om.*
i 5 φησὶ *i*

Fragmenta incertae sedis

141 Philodemus, *De Rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 1015, fr. 6.1–7 (BT 1.272
Sudhaus)

172 W 6 πεπαιγμένος [
... ι φάσεις ἔθη[κεν
____ τους· ὃ δὲ Λύσιν [γεγρα-
φέναι Δη[μ]ήτ[ριος ὁ Φαλη-
5 ρεὺς ἐν τοῖς πε[ρὶ τῆς ῥη-

fore, since this is the commendation that gives you your start and since you are whatever you are as a result of this, you must prepare yourself for speaking as if the verdict on the whole of your talent will depend (on your performance) in every single case. As
3 for the means of enhancing this faculty (of speaking), which I know you have laid by, be sure that you have them prepared and at hand, and remind yourself often of what Demetrius has written about the application and practice of Demosthenes.

¹ Cicero's brother Quintus is addressing his brother in this brief tract on Cicero's canvass for the consulship in 63.

Athenian Orators

cp. 155–6; 163–4

140 *The Life of Aeschines* 3.6–7 (BT 6.112–7 Dilts)

- 6 (Item:) According to Demetrius of Phalerum, he (Aeschines) was a pupil of the philosopher Socrates and then later on of Plato.
7 But according to Caecilius, Idomeneus and Hermippus he did not attend the lectures of these men to learn from them. For, as they say, he does not maintain at all the characteristic Platonic style,....

Fragments of Uncertain Provenience

141 Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 1015, fr. 6.1–7 (BT 1.272 Sudhaus)

... As for what Demetrius of Phalerum in his treatise *On*

τορικῆς ...[
σιν εἶναι κα [

3–7 228 F 46 FGrH 3 Λύσιν] cf. D.L. 8.7

6–7 σ[υ]ν[γράμμασιν φη]σιν *dubitanter Sudhaus* 7 εἶναι *legit Dorandi*: εἰ καὶ *Sudhaus*

142 Philodemus, *De Rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 1015, fr. 23.10–15 (BT 1.279 Sudhaus)

205 W 10] καὶ Δημήτριος δια.
]νην τοῦτο νομίζων
]ν μὴ τοῦτον ἔθηκε τὸν
τρό]πον. [...] .αρ μᾶλλον διὰ
.αταρ..ων, ὧν ἐστὶν ἡ
15 ..[.....]. ὁ Ἄριστο.[

13 . [...] .αρ *par.* (γάρ ?): [ἀλλ]ὰ *Sudhaus* 15 ὁ *legit Dorandi* (ὁ Ἄριστοτ[έλης ?])

Homerica

143 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 5.4 177C–178A (BT 1.407.24–408.10; 408.22–409.7 Kaibel)

- C ἐδίδαξεν δ' Ὅμηρος καὶ οὐς οὐ δεῖ καλεῖν, ἀλλ' αὐτομάτους ἰέναι, πρεπόντως ἐξ ἑνὸς τῶν ἀναγκαίων δεικνὺς τὴν τῶν ὁμοίων παρουσίαν·
αὐτόματος δέ οἱ ἦλθε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος.
δῆλον γὰρ ὥς οὔτε ἀδελφὸν οὔτε γονέας οὔτε γυναῖκα 5
κλητέον οὔτ' εἴ τις ἰσοτίμως τινὰς τούτοις ἄγει· καὶ γὰρ ἂν ψυχρὸν εἶη καὶ ἄφιλον. καίτοι τινὲς στίχον προσ-
έγραψαν τὴν αἰτίαν προστιθέντες·
ἦδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφεὸν ὥς ἐπονείτο,
D ὥσπερ δέον εἰπεῖν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν ἀδελφὸς αὐτόματος ἂν 10
ἦκοι πρὸς δεῖπνον, πιθανῆς τῆς αἰτίας ἀποδιδομένης. ...
E Ἀθηνοκλῆς δ' ὁ Κυζικηνὸς μᾶλλον Ἀριστάρχου κατ-
ακούων τῶν Ὀμηρικῶν ἐπῶν εὐπαιδευτότερον ἡμῖν
φησι τοῦτον Ὅμηρον καταλιπεῖν, ὥς τῆς ἀνάγκης ὁ
Μενέλεως οἰκειότερως εἶχεν. Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Φαληρεὺς 15

Rhetoric says that Lysis¹ has written ...

¹ On Lysis of Tarentum see J. Stenzel, *RE* 14,1 (1928) 64–5 s.v. Lysis 2.

- 142** Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 1015, fr. 23.10–15 (*BT* 1.279 Sudhaus)

... and Demetrius ... considering this ... not put in that manner ...

Homerica

- 143** Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 5.4 177C–178A (*BT* 1.407.24–408.10; 408.22–409.7 Kaibel)

C Homer has also taught us who need not be invited (to a feast), but come of their own accord: by (naming) one of the relatives he quite properly indicates the presence of others in a similar position:

“Of his own accord, Menelaus, good at the battle cry, came to him.”

For it is plain that one does not need invite either a brother, or parents, or a wife, or anyone else whom one holds in equal esteem with these; for that would be cold and unfriendly. And yet some authorities have composed an additional verse, (thereby) adding the reason:

“For he knew in his heart how his brother was labouring”¹

- D —as though it were necessary to state the reason why a brother might come to dinner of his own accord, the reason given (above)
E being convincing as it is. ...² Athenocles of Cyzicus, with a better

- F ἐπαρίστερον τὴν τοῦ στίχου παράληψιν ἐπειπὼν καὶ τῆς ποιήσεως ἀλλότριον, τὸν
 ἦδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφεὸν ὡς ἐπονείτο
 μικρολογίαν ἐμβάλλειν τοῖς ἡθεσιν. “οἶμαι γάρ,” φησὶν,
 178A “ἕκαστον τῶν χαριέντων ἀνθρώπων ἔχειν καὶ οἰκεῖον 20
 καὶ φίλον πρὸς ὃν ἂν ἔλθοι θυσίας οὔσης τὸν καλοῦντα
 μὴ περιμείνας.”

1–22 = *Ath. Epit.* (2.1.59.12–21 *Peppink*) [= *EC*] = *Seleucus F 9 M. Müller, De Seleuco Homérico* 1891, 11–13; cf. *schol. bT ad Hom. Il.* 2.405–9; 408; 409 1–11 ἐδίδαξεν—δεῖπνον] = *Eust. Il.* 2.408 (1.376.25–377.3 *van der Valk*) 4 *Hom. Il.* 2.408 9 *Hom. Il.* 2.409 9–17 ἦδεε—ἀλλότριον] cf. *A. Ludwich, Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik*, 1884, 216–17 15–16 Δημήτριος—ἐπειπὼν] = *Eust. Il.* 2.408 (1.377.3–4 *van der Valk*) 19–22 cf. 1.123–5

1 *post* καλεῖν *hab.* ἐν συμποσίῳ *EC, Eust.* 2–4 πρεπόντως—Μενέλαος] *om. Eust.* 2–3 πρεπόντως—παρουσίαν] *om. EC* || πρεπόντων *A: corr. s* 6 ἰσοτίμους *Eust.* 8 αἰτίαν *EC: om. A* 11–15 πιθανῆς—εἶχεν *om. EC* 11 (οὐδὲ) πιθανῆς *Wilamowitz* 14 τοῦτον καταλιπεῖν] τοῦτο—καταλιπεῖν (ὑπονοῆσαι) *Wilamowitz* || ὡς] ὅσῳ *Kaibel* 15 εἶχεν *Casaubon: ἔχειν A* 16 ἐπειπὼν] οἶδε *Eust.: ὑπειπὼν Dobree* 17 ἀλλοτρίαν *Kaibel* 16–18 καὶ τῆς—ἐπονείτο *om. EC* 19 ἐμβάλλειν *Kaibel: ἐμβάλλει AEC* 20 ἀνθρώπων *om. EC*

144 Scholium in Homeri *Odysseam* 3.267 (1.143.15–144.6 Dindorf)

- 191 W πὰρ γὰρ ἔην καὶ ἀοιδὸς] οὕτω Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς· Μενέλαος ἅμα τῷ Ὀδυσσεὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Δελφοὺς τὸν θεὸν ἤρετο περὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι εἰς Ἴλιον στρατείας. τότε δὴ καὶ τὸν ἐνναετηρικὸν τῶν Πυθίων ἀγῶνα ἀγωνοθετεῖ Κρέων, ἐνίκα δὲ Δημόδοκος Λάκων μαθητῆς 5
 Αὐτομήδους τοῦ Μυκηναίου, ὃς ἦν πρῶτος δι' ἐπῶν γράψας τὴν Ἀμφιτρύωνος πρὸς Τηλεβόας μάχην καὶ τὴν ἔριν Κιθαιρῶνός τε καὶ Ἑλικῶνος, ἀφ' ὧν δὴ καὶ τὰ ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ ὄρη προσαγορεύεται· ἦν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μαθητῆς Περιμήδους Ἀργείου, ὃς ἐδίδαξεν αὐτόν τε τὸν 10
 Μυκηναῖον Αὐτομήδην, καὶ Λικύμνιον τὸν Βουπράσιον καὶ †Σίνιν καὶ † τὸν Δωριέα, καὶ Φαρίδαν τὸν Λάκωνα, καὶ Πρόβολον τὸν Σπαρτιάτην. τότε δὴ Μενέλαος τῇ προνοίᾳ τῆς Ἑλένης ἀνέθηκεν ὄρμον Ἀθηνᾶ. τὸν δὲ

understanding of the Homeric epics than Aristarchus, is more instructive when he tells us that Homer passed over Menelaus without mention because he was closer kin (to Agamemnon).³ Demetrius of Phalerum characterized the interpolation of the
F verse as awkward and foreign to the poet's style, (saying) that the (verse)

“for he knew in his heart how his brother was labouring”
imparts meanness to the characters. “For I am of the opinion,” he
178A says, “that among courteous people each person has both a relative and a friend, to whom he may go when a sacrificial feast is on without waiting for that person to invite (him).”

¹ I.e., in making preparations for the meeting with the chieftains, sending out invitations and arranging for the sacrifice and subsequent feast.

² Athenaeus goes on to discuss the absurdity of supposing (a) that Menelaus did not know Agamemnon was preparing a sacrificial feast; or (b) that he did know there was a feast, but came uninvited because he wanted to spare his brother the trouble of inviting him, occupied as he was with the preparations. This last interpretation appears to have been that of Aristarchus.

³ I.e., than Nestor, Idomeneus, both Aiantes, Diomedes and Odysseus of whom Homer tells us explicitly that they had been invited by Agamemnon (*Iliad* 2.405–7).

144 Scholium on Homer' *Odyssey* 3.267 (1.143.15–144.6 Dindorf)

“For there was a singer with (her) too”: Thus Demetrius of Phalerum: Menelaus went to Delphi together with Odysseus to ask the god about the expedition that was to take place against Troy. At that same time Creon is presiding at the nine-years' competition of the Pythian Games. Demodocus of Laconia won first prize, a pupil of Automedes of Mycenae who was the first to write in epic verses about the battle of Amphitryon against the Teleboae and about the quarrel of Cithaeron and Helicon, from whom, as is well-known, the mountains in Boeotia take their name. He himself too was a pupil of Perimedes of Argos, who had taught both Automedes of Mycenae himself and Licymnius of Buprasium and †Sinis and † the Dorian and Pharidas of Laconia and Probolus of Sparta. At that time then Menelaus dedicated to the Athena Of Forethought the necklace of Helen. Agamemnon took Demo-

Δημόδοκον εἰς Μυκῆνας λαβὼν Ἀγαμέμνων ἔταξε τὴν 15
 Κλυταιμνήστραν τηρεῖν. ἐτίμων δὲ λῖαν τοὺς ῥδοὺς ὡς
 διδασκάλους τῶν τε θεῶν καὶ παλαιῶν ἀνδραγαθη-
 μάτων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὀργάνων πλεον τὴν λύραν
 ἡγάπων. δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρα τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν
 τιμὴν· οὐ γὰρ φονεύειν, ἀλλ' ἀφορίζειν αὐτὸν ἐκέλευσε. 20
 Τιμόλαος δὲ ἀδελφὸν αὐτὸν φησιν εἶναι Φημίου,

1–21 *scholium EHMQR; minus plene in T; cf. 146; = Eust. Od. 3.267*
(1.125.27–38 Stallbaum) = 228 F 32a FGrH 1–16 [Demodocus]
EpGF Davies 94–5 21 = Timolaus F 850 SH Lloyd-Jones & Parsons

1 οὕτω—Φαληρεὺς] ὁ δὲ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἱστορεῖ ὅτι
Eust. 10 αὐτόν τε τὸν *M*: αὐτόν τε καὶ τὸν *rell.*: αὐτόν τε καὶ τὸν
 ῥηθέντα *Eust.* 11 Βουπράσιον] Βουπρασιέα *Eust.* 12 Σίνιν *M*:
 σίπια *EQRH*: καὶ τὸν *om. H*: καὶ Σίνιν καὶ τὸν Δωριέα *om. Eust.* 14
 προνοία] Προναία *Wehrli* 13–14 τῇ προνοίᾳ—Ἀθηνᾶ] τῇ Προνοίᾳ
 Ἀθηνᾶ *Eust.*: Ἀθηνᾶ *seclus. Jacoby* 16 ἐτίμων δὲ λῖαν] ἐτίμα γὰρ
 λῖαν φησὶ *Eust.* 17–18 παλαιῶν ἀνδραγαθημάτων] ἀνθρωπίνων
Eust. 18–19 καὶ τῶν—ἡγάπων *om. Eust.* 20 ἐκέλευσε] ἀφῆκε
Eustath.

145

Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 3.5.43 (3.269.5–9 Hense)

193 W

ἐκ τῆς Ἑρμίππου συναγωγῆς τῶν καλῶς ἀναφωνη-
 θέντων ἐξ Ὀμήρου.

Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς εἰς σωφροσύνην ἔλεγεν ταῦτα
 ποιεῖν,

ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἵκοντο. 5

1–5 228 F 33 FGrH = *Hermipp. F 92 Wehrli* 5 *Hom. Od. 23.296; cf.*
scholium HMQ ad loc. τοῦτο τέλος τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας φησὶν
 Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης

De aoedis

146

Prolegomena Tzetzae ad scholia in Lycophronis Alexandram
 (2.4.3–9 Scheer)

192 W

ᾠσματογράφων δὲ τῶν καὶ ᾠοιδῶν γνωρίσματα τὸ
 ᾠσματα καὶ ῥδὰς γράφειν πρὸς μουσικὴν καὶ φόρμιγγα
 καὶ βάρβιτον καὶ κιθάραν καὶ πᾶν ὄργανον μουσικὸν
 ἀδόμενον, οἷοίπερ ἦσαν ποιηταί, ὡς ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημή-

docus with him to Mycenae and appointed him to keep an eye on Clytemnestra. They held the singers in high esteem, as teachers of divine matters and of the brave deeds of the men of old, and they loved the lyre more than the other instruments. (The conduct of) Clytemnestra too shows the honour in which he was held. For she ordered him to be banished, not killed. Timolaus, on the other hand, says that he was a brother of Phemius,

145 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.5.43 (3.269.5–6 Hense)

From Hermippus' compilation of fine utterances (taken) from Homer:

Demetrius of Phalerum said that (Homer) composed the following line thinking of self-control:

“They (Odysseus and Penelope) then joyfully came to their old-established bed.”¹

¹ Translation R.D. Dawe.

On Singers

146 Tzetzes, *Introduction to the commentary on the Alexandra of Lycophron* (2.43–9 Scheer)

The distinctive characteristic by which writers of songs, (that is) those who (are) also singers, are to be recognized, (is) their writing songs and odes to the accompaniment of music and of the *phorminx*, the *barbitos*, the *kithara* and any musical instrument

τριος γράφει, Αὐτομήδης καὶ Δημόδοκος καὶ Λαῖρις οἱ 5
 Κερκυραῖοι καὶ ὁ Ἰθακήσιος Φήμιος καὶ οἱ λοιποί, οὓς
 ὁ Φαληρεὺς γράφει.

4–7 228 F 32b FGrH; cf. 144

4 ὥς] οὓς *dubitanter Jacoby* 5 Λαῖρις] *in* Χαῖρις *corr. γ2 (Pal. 18)*
m^l 6 *post* λοιποί *class. II add.* οὓς ὁ Φαληρεὺς γράφει

Grammatica et Orthographica

147 Victorinus, *Ars Grammatica* 1.4.95–6 (87.1–8 Mariotti)

- 196 W 95 repertores litterarum Cadmus ex Phoenice in Graeciam
 et Euander ad nos transtulerunt A B C D E [h] I K <L> M N O P
 [q] R S T <U> litteras numero XVI. postea quasdam a
 Palamede et alias a Simonide adiectas implesse numerum
 96 XXIII [In comoedia scriptum erat ‘ellum’: non recte vos 5
 fecistis ‘illum’: est enim ‘en illum’.] grammatici, praeterea
 Demetrius Phalereus, Hermocrates, ex nostris autem
 Cincius, Fabius, Gellius tradiderunt.

1–8 *Cincius Alimentus F 1 GRF Funaioli = F 1 HRR Peter = F 1 Ann. Rom. I 54–5 Chassignet; Fabius Pictor F 1 Funaioli = F 1 Peter = F 1 Ann. Rom. I 16–17 Chassignet; Gellius F 2 Funaioli = F 3 Peter; v. Mariotti p. 221–4 et Chassignet p. 17* 6–7 grammatici ... Demetrius] *cf. 62.5–6*

2–3 *h del. et L add. Camerarius, q del. et U add. Vossius* 5–6 in comoedia—‘en illum’ *del. Liebalddt: ‘Vera grammatici verba haec videntur, sed unde huc inreperint incertum’ Mariotti*

148 Scholium ad Tzetzae *Chiliadas* 5.209 (*An. Ox.* 3.365.25–8 Cramer)

- 173 W Ἀραβίας —
 Τὸ Ἀραψ γράφε μεθ’ ἐνός, μὴ δὲ διπλοῦ τοῦ ῥῶ μοι.
 Τζέτζης ὁ τοῦτο λέγων σοι· μὴ πείθου τοῖς βαναύσοις.
 καὶ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος Ῥητορικῆς φῆ γράφειν.

2–4 228 F 49 FGrH

used to accompany song.¹ Poets of this kind, as Demetrius of Phalerum writes, were Automedes, Demodocus and Laeris, all of Corcyra, Phemius of Ithaca and the rest, whom Demetrius of Phalerum mentions in writing.

¹ The *phorminx* is the round-based box lyre or 'cradle kithara'; the *barbitos* the long-armed bowl lyre; and the *kithara* the square-based box lyre or 'concert kithara'; see M.L. West, *Ancient Greek Music*, 1992, 50.

Grammar and Orthography

147 Victorinus, *Grammar* 1.4.95–6 (87.1–8 Mariotti)

- 95 The inventors of letters brought over, Cadmus from Phoenicia
to Greece and Euander to us, 16 letters: A B C D E [h] I K L M N
O P [q] R S T U. Later certain letters were added by Palamedes
and others by Simonides; that brought the number up to 24 (let-
96 ters). [In comedy 'ellum' was written: incorrectly you have made
'illum': for it is 'en illum'.] The grammarians, (and) in addition
Demetrius of Phalerum (and) Hermocrates, (and) further from
among our own countrymen Cincius, Fabius and Gellius, have
handed on this report.

148 Scholium on the *Chiliads* of Tzetzes 5.209 (*An. Ox.* 3.365.25–8 Cramer)

'Of Arabia':

Please write 'Arab' with one, not with a double rho. It is Tzetzes who is saying this to you; do not listen to the vulgar people. Demetrius of Phalerum too in his *Rhetoric* said to write (it this way).¹

¹ The syntax of l. 4 is quite unclear, but this is what it appears to mean.

Carmina

nullae inscriptiones inveniuntur, sed vide Diogenis Laertii *Vitas* 5.76 = 1.20–1, quo loco paeanes Demetrii commemorantur

Epistulae

149 Tabula inscriptionum ad epistulas spectantium

1 Ἐπιστολαὶ α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.104

cf. Δημητρίου [Φαληρέως] τύποι ἐπιστολικοί = 161

Miscellanea

150 Tabula inscriptionum ad res miscellaneas spectantium

1 Ἀρίσταιχος [έν]] *Tabula Rhodienis*, col. I 2 = 80.2

2 Ἀρτοξέρξης α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.80

3 Διονύσιος α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.99

4 Μαίδων α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.77

5 Περὶ τοῦ δοκοῦ α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.94

6 Περὶ τῶν Ἰώνων α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.87

7 Προοίμιον ἱστορικὸν α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.103

8 Πτολεμαῖος α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.74

9 Χαλκιδικὸς α΄] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.81 = 1.100

Songs

no titles are attested, but see Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.76 = 1.20–1, where paeans composed by Demetrius are mentioned

Letters

149 List of Titles Referring to Letters

- 1 *Letters*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.104

cp. Demetrius [of Phalerum], *Models for Letter-writing* = 161

Miscellaneous

150 List of Titles Referring to Miscellaneous Subjects

- 1 *Aristaechmus*, 1 book] *Rhodian Book Catalogue*, col. I 2 = 80.2
- 2 *Artoxerxes*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.80
- 3 *Dionysius*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.99
- 4 *Maedon*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.77
- 5 *On the Beam <in the Sky>*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.94¹
- 6 *On the Ionians*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.87
- 7 *An Historical Preface*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.103
- 8 *Ptolemy*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.74
- 9 *Chalcidian (Speech)*, 1 book] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.81 = 1.100

¹ See 1 note 3

IV. INCERTA

de inscriptione Ὑπὲρ ἐλέου vide 81

***151** *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 27.1194, 28–9

ἐν] Ἀθήναις 28

[ποτὶ] Δαμάτριον τὸν ῥήτορα μ(νᾶν) □ · 29

“KYRENE. STELE OF THE ΣΥΛΛΑ, CA. 335 B.C.” ed. G. Pugliese Carratelli, *ASA* 39–40 [N.S. 23–4] (1961–62) 273–80 no. 103 (= SEG 20.716) et *ibidem* 335–6 no. 207; nos. 103 et 207 collocaverunt C. Dobias-Lalou et A. Laronde, *REG* 90 (1977) 1–14 (= SEG 27.1194); iterum edidit A. Laronde, *Cyrène et la Libye Hellénistique*, 1987, 149–50

***152** *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 25.206

Σφήττιοι Δημ[ήτριον]
Φανοστράτου ἀ[νέθηκαν].
Ἀντίγνωτος ἐποίη[σε].

“Demetrius Phalereus a Sphettiis honoratur, a. 315/14^a (?). In colle *Kastro tou Christou*, occidentem versus a vico *Koropi*, nunc in Museo Epigr. (EM n. 13379). Partem maiorem baseos magnae marm., e fragmentis viginti octo repositam”; ed. A.G. Kalogérpoulou, *BCH* 93 (1969) 56–71; cf. *titulum Eleusine repertum* = 162

***153** *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae* 6.45–6 245A–C (BT 2.47.7–48.4 Kaibel)

“Χαιρεφῶν δέ,” φησίν, “ὁ παράσιτος εἰς γάμον ἄκλητος εἰσελθὼν καὶ κατακλιθεὶς ἔσχατος καὶ τῶν γυναικονόμων ἀριθμούντων τοὺς κεκλημένους καὶ κελευόντων αὐτὸν ἀποτρέχειν ὡς παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἐπὶ τοῖς τριάκοντα ἐπόντος, ‘ἀριθμεῖτε δὴ,’ ἔφη, ‘πάλιν ἀπ’ 5
46 ἐμοῦ ἀρξάμενοι.” ὅτι δ’ ἦν ἔθος τοὺς γυναικονόμους
B ἐφορᾶν τὰ συμπόσια καὶ ἐξετάζειν τῶν κεκλημένων τὸν ἀριθμὸν εἰ ὁ κατὰ νόμον ἐστί, Τιμοκλῆς ἐν Φιλοδικαστῇ φησὶν οὕτως·
ἀνοίγεται ἤδη τὰς θύρας, ἵνα πρὸς τὸ φῶς 10
ᾧμεν καταφανεῖς μᾶλλον, ἐφοδεύων ἐὰν βούληθ’ ὁ γυναικονόμος ἱλαβεῖν ἀριθμόν†,

IV. UNCERTAIN

on the title *On Compassion* see 81

***151** *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 27.1194, 28–9

in Athens to Demetrius the rhetor (the amount) of 100 minae¹

¹ On the stele of the σῶλα (“droits de représailles qui ont été réglés”) see C. Dobias-Lalou and A. Laronde, *Cyrène et la Libye Hellénistique*, 1987, 149–61. The identification of “Demetrius the rhetor” with Demetrius of Phalerum is partly based on IG II² 2971 = 162, which here has been brought in relation with his grandson Demetrius the Younger. The inscription, however, appears to be IVth century (Stephen V. Tracy *per litteras*) and has for that reason been put under the ‘Incerta’ and not under the ‘Non Recepta’.

***152** *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 25.206

The inhabitants of (the deme) Sphettus¹ have erected (a statue of) Demetrius, son of Phanostratus. Antignotus made (it).²

¹ Sphettus is an inland deme of the tribe Acamantis south-east of Athens. This is the only deme document listed by D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica*, 1986, 390.

² On this statue base see Habicht *Athen* 64⁴⁸; Tracy *ADT* 39¹⁹, and in this volume.

***153** Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 6.45–6 245A–C (BT 2.47.7–48.4 Kaibel)

“The parasite Chaerephon,”¹ he (Lynceus) says, “joined a wedding party without being invited and lay down at the farthest end (of the table); and when the inspectors of women counted the guests and told him to run off because contrary to the law he was one too many above the (allowed) thirty, he said ‘Then count
46 again, starting with me’.” That it was customary for the inspectors
B of women to inspect dinner parties and check whether the number of guests was that allowed by the law, Timocles states in the *Jury-Lover* in the following words:²

“Now open the door, so we will be open to the sunlight and better to see for everybody, in case the inspector of women, in making his rounds, wants to †get the number† of the members

κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν καινὸν ὅπερ εἶωθε δρᾶν,
τῶν ἐστιωμένων. ἔδει δὲ τοῦμπαλιν
τὰς τῶν ἀδείπνων ἐξετάζειν οἰκίας.

15

Μένανδρος δ' ἐν Κεκρυφάλῳ·

C παρὰ τοῖς γυναικονόμοις δὲ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς γάμοις
διακονοῦντας ἀπογεγράφθαι πυθόμενος
πάντας μαγείρους κατὰ νόμον καινόν τινα,
ἵνα πυνθάνωνται τοὺς κεκλημένους ἐὰν
πλείους τις ὢν ἔξεστιν ἐστιῶν τύχη,
ἐλθὼν ...

20

καὶ Φιλόχορος δ' ἐν ἐβδόμῃ Ἀτθίδος “οἱ γυναικο-
νόμοι,” φησί, “μετὰ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἐσκόπουν τὰς ἐν
ταῖς οἰκίαις συνόδους ἐν τε τοῖς γάμοις καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις 25
θυσίαις.”

1–8 *Ath. Epit.* (2.1.95.12–17 Peppink) 10–15 *Timocl. F 34 PCG K.-A* 17–22 *Men. F 238 Koerte* 23–6 *Ath. Epit.* (2.1.95.17–19 Peppink); *Philoch.* 328 F 65 FGrH 23–4 *de gynaeconomis* cf. *Poll.* 8.112; *Harp. o* 47; *Hsch.* π 2475 Schmidt; *Plu. Sol.* 21.7; *schol. bT in Hom. Il.* 10.419–20c; *Eust. Il.* 10.418–22 (3.102.15 van der Valk); *et v. Jacoby FGrH III b Suppl. I* 339–40 *et II* 245–6 *ad* 328 F 65 24 Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν] cf. 7.5

1 δέ, φησιν *Kaibel*: δ' ἔφησεν A 12†λαβεῖν ἀριθμόν†] λαβεῖν ἀριθμόν A: τὸν ἀρ. καταλαβεῖν *Schweighaeuser*, τὸν ἀρ. λαμβάνειν *Dobree Adv. II* 311: ἀπολαβεῖν τὸν ἀριθμόν *Dindorf* 21 τύχη *Musurus*: τύχης A

154

Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 3.12.18 (3.446.16–447.2 Hense)

198 W

Δημητρίου.

Δημήτριος ἐρωτηθεὶς τί φαῦλον τοῖς ψευδομένοις παρακολουθεῖ, εἶπε “τὸ μηδ' ἂν τᾶληθῇ λέγωσιν ἔτι πιστεύεσθαι.”

1–4 *habent MA post eclogam Theophrasti* (12, 19 Meineke = *Thphr. no.* 445 *FHS&G*), *Br post eclogam Thaletis* (12, 14 Meineke), *post eclogam Euripidis* (12, 5 Meineke) *Macarius Chrysocephalus, om. S*; cf. *apophthegma quod Ibyco attribuitur in Gnom. Vat.* 743, no. 366; *etiam* cf. *apophthegma ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ὄφελος τοῖς ψευδομένοις ἐκ τοῦ ψεύδους ἔφη· τὸ κἂν ἀληθῇ λέγωσι μὴ πιστεύεσθαι, quod Aesopo attribuitur in Max.* 35 (*PG* 91.900.29–31 *Combefis*) *et Ars.* 93.7–9 Walz; *Socrati attribuitur in Flor. Mon.* 239 (*BT* 4.287.6–8 Meineke) [= →

of the party, something he is wont to do according to the new law. Instead of doing that he should inspect the houses of those who go without dinner.”³

And Menander in the *Hair-Net*:⁴

C “On hearing that according to some new law the inspectors of women had a list of all cooks who catered at wedding parties, so they could make inquiries about the guests, in case anyone happened to entertain more (guests) than was allowed, he went ...”

And Philochorus too in the seventh book of his *History of Attica* says “the inspectors of women inspected, together with the members of the Areopagus, the companies gathered in the houses on occasions of weddings and sacrificial feasts.”⁵

¹ Chaerephon was a notorious parasite.

² The comic poet Timocles was slightly older than Menander.

³ The phrase “who go without dinner” appears to hint at a period of food shortage.

⁴ The *Hair-Net* is held to belong to Menander’s earliest work. Often a more exact dating is based upon the assumed link with Demetrius of Phalerum.

⁵ Although Demetrius is not explicitly mentioned, it is generally assumed that he was responsible for the institution of the *gynaikonomoi*, but this “can be neither refuted nor proved” (Jacoby *FGrH* III b Suppl. I 340). Cp. C. Wehrli, “Les gynéconomes,” *MH* 19 (1962) 33–8; Habicht *Athen* p. 69 and note 68.

154 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.12.18 (3.446.16–447.2 Hense)

By Demetrius.

Demetrius, when asked what is the bad thing that awaits liars, said: “That they are no longer believed even if they speak the truth.”¹

¹ Cp. Wehrli p. 87 ad F 198, who considers attributing this saying, like Stob. 3.8.20 = 165, to Demetrius the Cynic.

155 *Vita Isocratis* 153–60 (CB 1. XXXVII Mathieu-Brémond)

154 W ἐβίωσε δ' οἱ μὲν λέγουσιν ὥς ὅτι ἑκατὸν ἔτη, οἱ δὲ
 ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ὀκτώ. ἀπέθανε δ' ἐπὶ Χαιρώνδου
 ἄρχοντος μετὰ τὴν ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχην, λυπηθεὶς διὰ
 τὴν ἥτταν καὶ τὴν συμφορὰν τὴν γενομένην ἐκεῖσε τοῖς
 Ἀθηναίοις παρὰ Φιλίππου. ἀποκαρτερήσας δὲ ἐτε- 5
 λεύτησεν, ὥς μὲν Δημήτριός φησιν ἐννέα ἡμέρας, ὥς δὲ
 Ἀφαρεὺς δεκατέσσaras. προαναγνοὺς δὲ τούτους τοὺς
 στίχους ἐτελεύτησεν ἐκ τριῶν δραμάτων Εὐριπίδου.

1–8 *similiter* [Plu.] *Vitae X or.* 837E et 838B (BT 5.2.1.14.17–21 et
 15.24–16.1 Mau), *sine mentione Demetrii* 2–7 228 F 36 FGrH 7
 Ἀφαρεὺς] cf. Harp. α 274 8 ἐκ τριῶν δραμάτων Εὐριπίδου] F 228
 N.² = F 282a Mette, *Lustrum* 12 (1967) 77; IT 1; F 819 N.² = F 1155f
 Mette, *Lustrum* 12 (1967) 280

3 Χαιρώνδου Mathieu: Χαρώνδου codd. 5–6 ἀποκαρτερήσας—
 ἡμέρας] ἐξελεθῆναι δὲ τοῦ βίου οἱ μὲν ἐναταῖον φασὶ σίτων
 ἀποσχόμενον, οἱ δὲ τεταρταῖον [Plu.]

156 Plutarchus, *Demosthenes* 14.1–2 (BT 1.2.293.19–294.1 Ziegler)

133 W 1 τῶν γοῦν κατ' αὐτὸν ὁ Φωκίων, οὐκ ἐπαινουμένης
 προϊστάμενος πολιτείας, ἀλλὰ δοκῶν μακεδονίζειν,
 ὅμως δι' ἀνδρείαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην οὐδὲν οὐδαμῇ
 χείρων ἔδοξεν Ἐφιάλτου καὶ Ἀριστείδου καὶ Κίμωνος
 2 ἀνὴρ γενέσθαι. Δημοσθένης δ' οὐκ ὢν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις 5
 ἀξιόπιστος, ὥς φησιν ὁ Δημήτριος, οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ λαμ-
 βάνειν παντάπασιν ἀπωχυρωμένος, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὲν παρὰ
 Φιλίππου καὶ ἐκ Μακεδονίας ἀνάλωτος ὢν, τῷ δ'
 ἄνωθεν ἐκ Σούσων καὶ Ἐκβατάνων ἐπιβατὸς χρυσίῳ
 γεγονὼς καὶ κατακεκλυσμένος, ἐπαινέσαι μὲν ἦν 10
 ἱκανώτατος τὰ τῶν προγόνων καλά, μιμήσασθαι δ' οὐχ
 ὁμοίως.

1–12 cf. *quae de facultate loquendi Phocionis Demosthenisque*
Theophrastus dixisse legitur in 10.2–3 (= no. 706 FHS&G) 5–12 228
 F 19 FGrH

1 κατ' αὐτὸν Lambinus: μετ' αὐτὸν codd. 12 ὁμοίως Reiske: ὁμοιος
 codd.

155 *The Life of Isocrates* 152–60 (CB 1.XXXVII Mathieu-Brémond)

He (Isocrates) lived one hundred years according to some, ninety-eight according to others. He died during the archonship of Chaerondas¹ after the battle at Chaeronea, distressed on account of the disastrous defeat which the Athenians suffered there at the hands of Philip. He died after starving himself for nine days according to Demetrius, for fourteen according to Aphareus.² Before dying, he read aloud the following verses from three of Euripides' plays.³

¹ I.e., 338/7 B.C.

² Son of Hippias but considered as the son of Isocrates.

³ The opening verses of the *Archelaus*, *Iphigenia Taurica* and *Phrixus*. On this fragment see Wehrli p. 89 on F 206 and cp. 140; 156; 163–4; the last two are included by Mejer in the fragments of Demetrius of Magnesia.

156 Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 14.1–2 (BT 1.2.293.19–294.1 Ziegler)

- 1 Of his (Demosthenes) contemporaries in any case Phocion, championing a political line that did not meet with approval and being considered favourable to Macedonia, was nevertheless held to be a man not at all inferior in any way to Ephialtes and Aristides
- 2 and Cimon for his courage and just disposition. Demosthenes on the other hand was not reliable when under arms, as Demetrius says, nor altogether immune to taking money: although he could not be corrupted by gold from Philip or from Macedonia, he was accessible to that coming down from Susa and Ecbatana and overwhelmed by it. He was highly effective in praising the noble deeds of previous generations, but less so in imitating them.¹

¹ On this fragment see Wehrli p. 89 on F 206 and cp. 140; 155; 163–4; the last two are included by Mejer in the fragments of Demetrius of Magnesia.

V. SPURIA

157 Scholium AD in Homeri *Iliadem* 6.35 (ed. Janus Lascaris [D])

207 W

Πήδασον αἰπεινήν. Ἀχιλλεὺς ὑπὸ τὸν Τρωϊκὸν πόλε-
 μον πορθῶν τὰς περιοίκους τῆς Ἰλίου πόλεις, ἀφίκετο εἰς
 τὴν πάλαι μὲν Μονηνίαν, νῦν δὲ Πήδασον καλουμένην,
 βουλόμενος ὁμοῦ ταῖς ἄλλαις καὶ ταύτην ἐλεῖν.
 ἀπογνόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τὴν εἰς τὸ τέλος πολιορκίαν διὰ τὴν 5
 ὀχυρότητα τοῦ τόπου καὶ μέλλοντος ἤδη ἀναχωρεῖν,
 φασὶν εἶσω τῶν τειχῶν οὖσαν παρθένον ἐρασθῆναι τοῦ
 Ἀχιλλέως, καὶ λαβοῦσαν μῆλον, ἐπιγράψαι καὶ αὐτὸ
 ῥῖψαι εἰς μέσον τῶν Ἀχαιῶν· ἦν δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα·

“μὴ σπεῦδ’, Ἀχιλλεῦ, πρὶν Μονηνίαν ἔλῃς.” 10

ὕδωρ γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστι· διψῶσι κακῶς.”

τὸν δὲ Ἀχιλλέα ἐπιμείναντα οὕτω λαβεῖν τὴν πόλιν τῇ
 τοῦ ὕδατος σπάνει. ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Δημητρίῳ καὶ
 Ἡσιόδῳ.

1–14 = *schol. A in Il. 6.35* (1.228.1–10 Dindorf) = *Ars. 134.22–136.4*
Walz; cf. *schol. in Il. 6.35a* (2.136.74–7 Erbse) et *J.U. Powell, CR 27*
(1913) 130–1; 228 F 50 FGrH = *Demetrius Scepsius F 32 Gaede* = *Hes.*
F 214 Merkelbach-West; cf. *Eust. Il. 6.35* (2.237.7–13 van der Valk) et
fabulam a Parthenio 21.2 relatum = *A.R. F 12 CA Powell*

3 Μονηνίαν A: Μονηίαν D (*iterum* 10) 4 βουλόμενος D: *om.* A ||
 ὁμοῦ—ταύτην] αὐτὴν σὺν ταῖς ἄλλαις A 5 ἀπογνόντος D:
 ταπεινοῦντος A: ἀποροῦντος *Ars.* 5–6 τὴν ὀχυρότητα DA: τὰ
 ἰσχυρότατα *Ars.* 6 καὶ *om.* A || ἤδη *om.* A 7 οὖσαν D: οὐσάν τινα
 A 8 *post* μῆλον *add.* εἰς τοῦτο A || αὐτὸ *om.* A 9 γεγραμμένα D:
 -μένον A 10 ἔλῃς D, *Ars.*, *Eust.*: ἐλεῖν A 11 κακῶς *om.* *Ars.* 13–
 14 ἡ ἱστορία—Ἡσιόδῳ *om.* *Ars.*

158 Stephanus Byzantius, *Ethnica* s.v. Κορόπη (1.375.8–376.4
Meineke)

208 W

Κορόπη, πόλις Θεσσαλίας. ὁ πολίτης Κοροπαῖος.
 Νίκανδρος ἐν Θηριακοῖς “ἦ ἐν Ἀπόλλων | μαντείας
 Κοροπαῖος ἐθήκατο καὶ θέμιν ἀνδρῶν.” οἱ δὲ ὑπομνη-
 ματίσαντες αὐτὸν Θέων καὶ Πλούταρχος καὶ Δημήτριος
 ὁ Φαληρεύς φασι “Νίκανδρος Ὀροπαῖος καὶ Κοροπαῖος 5
 Ἀπόλλων. ἀγνοεῖ δ’ ὅτι Ἀμφιαράου ἱερόν, (οὐκ)

V. SPURIOUS

157 Scholium AD on Homer's *Iliad* 6.35 (ed. Janus Lascaris [D])

“high and steep Pedasus.” Achilles, while ravaging the cities lying around Ilium during the Trojan War, reached what in ancient times was called Monenia, but now Pedasus, because he wanted to take that (city) too together with the others. When he had despaired of carrying the siege through because of the strength of the place and already was about to withdraw, they say that there was a maiden within the walls who fell in love with Achilles; and that she took an apple, wrote on it and threw it in the midst of the Achaeans. On it was written:

“Don't hurry off, Achilles, without having captured Monenia;
For there is no water within; the people suffer terribly from
thirst.”

(They say) that Achilles stayed on and thus took the city thanks to the lack of water. The story (is to be found) in Demetrius and in Hesiod.¹

¹ On this scholium see Montanari in this volume, who attributes it to Demetrius of Scepsis.

158 Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethnica* under *Korope* (1.375.8–376.4 Meineke)

Corope: a city in Thessaly. Its citizen (is called a) Coropaeon. Nicander in his (poem) *Poisonous Animals*: “in which¹ Coropaeon Apollo established oracles and law for men.” His commentators, Theon and Plutarch and Demetrius of Phalerum, say: “Nicander (uses) ‘Oropaeon’ and ‘Coropaeon’ Apollo. He does not know that the precinct belongs to Amphiaraus, <not> to

Ἀπόλλωνός ἐστι. λέγεται δὲ κατ' ἔλλειψιν τοῦ ἰ
 Κοροπαῖος [Κορόπη]. Κορόπη δὲ Θεσσαλίας πόλις.
 βέλτιον δ' ὑπονοεῖν ὅτι ἡμάρτηται. καὶ γράφεται
 Ὀροπαῖος. Ὀρόπη γὰρ πόλις Εὐβοίας, ὅπου Ἀπόλλωνος 10
 διασημότατον ἱερόν."

1-11 = *Theon F 3 Guhl* 2-7 = *Plu. F 14.2 Bernardakis* = *F 115 Sandbach*

2 *Nic. Ther. 613-14* || ἡ ἐν *Nic.*: αἰὲν *codd.* || μαντοσύνας *Nic.* 5 ὁ
 Φαληρεὺς] 'scribendum videtur ὁ Χλωρός' *Meineke*; ὁ Χλωρός
Wytttenbach et Sandbach in Plu.; de Demetrio Chlora cf. schol. in Nic.
Ther. 377-8a; 585a 6 δ' ὅτι *Salmasius*: δὲ τὸ *codd.* || οὐκ *add.*
Salmasius 7 τοῦ κ' Ὀροπαῖος *Holsten* 8 Κορόπη *seclus. Holsten*

- 159** Δημητρίου Φαληρέως Περὶ ἐρμηνείας. vide *Demetrii Phalerii qui dicitur De Elocutione Libellus* ed. L. Radermacher, Lipsiae 1901

204 W cf. Ammonius, *In Aristotelis de interpretatione commentarius* (4.5.4.29-31 Busse); Phoebammonis *Prolegomena in Hermogenis* Περὶ Ἰδεῶν (RhGr 14.377.12-13 Rabe); Ioannis Siculi *Prolegomena in Hermogenis* Περὶ Ἰδεῶν (RhGr 14.410.12 Rabe); Theophylactus, Archiepiscopus Bulgariae, *Epist. 34 ad Theophylactum Romanum* (PG 126.556D.45-7 de Rubeis) ὁ δὲ Φαληρεὺς καὶ περὶ ἐρμηνείας λόγου συνταγμάτων σπουδαῖον ἐξήνεγκεν

- 160** Scholium ad Tzetzae *Allegorias Iliadis* 16, 371-3 (*An. Ox.* 3.384.29-30 Cramer)

204 W τοῦ δὲ μικροῦ τὴν Ἰλῖον Πάτροκλος μεθ' Ἑλλήνων |
 τῷ τότε ἂν ἐπόρθησε, λόγος ἐστὶν ἀστεῖος | καὶ χάρις
 ἐπιτάφιος εἰς Πάτροκλον Ὀμήρου] Γραφὴν Ὀμήρου
 ἀστεῖαν· ὁ Φαληρεὺς δὲ χάριν ὀνομάζει τὸ ἀστεῖον.

1-4 = *Anecdota Graeca* 2.618 *Matranga* 1-2 τοῦ—ἐπόρθησε] cf.
Hom. Il 16.698-9

3 γραφὴν] σημείωσαι τὴν γραφὴν *An. Gr. Matranga*

Apollo. It is spelled ‘Coropaeon’ without the i. But Corope (is) a city in Thessaly. It is better to conjecture that a mistake has been made. There is also a reading Oropaeon. For Oropo is a city on Euboea, where there is a highly renowned precinct of Apollo.”²

¹ I.e., in a “young tamarisk bush,” mentioned by Nicander in l. 612.

² On this confused note see U. von Wilamowitz, *Euripides Herakles* I 191¹⁴¹, and for Demetrius Chlorus see Montanari in this volume.

- 159** Demetrius [of Phalerum], *On Style*. See *Demetrii Phalerii qui dicitur De Elocutione Libellus* ed. L. Radermacher, Lipsiae 1901

Cp. Ammonius, *Commentary on Aristoteles’ On interpretation* (4.5.4.29–31 Busse); Phoebammon, *Introduction to On Stylistic Types of Hermogenes* (RhGr 14.377.12–13 Rabe); John of Sicily, *Introduction to On Stylistic Types of Hermogenes* (RhGr 14.410.12 Rabe); Theophylact, Archbishop of Bulgaria, *Letter 34 To Theophylact of Rome* (PG 126.556D.45–7 de Rubeis) “the Phalerean has also brought out an excellent little treatise on prose composition.”

- 160** Scholium on Tzetzes’ *Allegories on Book 16 of the Iliad*, 371–3 (*An. Ox.* 3.384.29–30 Cramer)

“At that moment Patroclus would almost have destroyed Ilium with the Hellenes, the expression is elegant, and it is a funereal homage of Homer towards Patroclus”: (Understand this to mean that) the writing of Homer is elegant.¹ The Phalerean calls (the quality of) elegance ‘charm’.²

¹ In his *Allegories of the Iliad*, Tzetzes is commenting upon *Iliad* 16.698–701: Patroclus would have taken Troy if Apollo had not taken a stand upon the walls of Troy and pushed him back thrice.

² On this fragment see Wehrli p. 89; F. Solmsen, *Hermes* 66 (1931) 263²; and W. Rhys Roberts, *Demetrius on Style*, 1902, 61.

268 Demetrius of Phalerum

161 Δημητρίου [Φαληρέως] τύποι ἐπιστολικοί. vide *Demetrii et Libanii qui feruntur ΤΥΠΟΙ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΙ et ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙ-*
203W *ΜΑΙΟΙ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΕΣ* ed. V. Weichert, Lipsiae 1910, p. 1–
12. de auctore vide Weichert p. xvii–xviii.

- 161** Demetrius [of Phalerum], *Models for letter-writing*. See *Demetrii et Libanii qui feruntur ΤΥΠΟΙ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΙ et ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΙΜΑΙΟΙ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΕΣ* ed. V. Weichert, Lipsiae 1910, p. 1–12. On the author see Weichert p. xvii–xviii.

VI. NON RECEPTA

de inscriptionibus Δικανικῶν Λόγων Συναγωγή et Σοφισ-
τικῶν vel Ἐπιδεικτικῶν Λόγων Συναγωγή, ab Wehrli p. 37
positis, vide 118

162 Inscriptiones Graecae II² 2971

20 W

in fronte:

Ἀθηναίων οἱ τεταγμένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου
ἐν Ἐλευσίνι καὶ Πανάκτῳ καὶ ἐπὶ Φυλῇ τὸν
στρατηγὸν Δημήτριον Φανοστράτου Φαληρέα
στεφανώσαντες Δήμητρι καὶ Κόρει ἀνέθηκαν. 1

in coronis (a–d, e–h/i–k/l–m):

a	b	c	d	
Ἀθηναίων οἱ τεταγμέ- νοι Ἐλευσίνι	Ἀθηναίων οἱ τεταγμέ- νοι ἐμ Πα- νάκτῳ	Ἀθηναίων οἱ τετα- γμένοι ἐπὶ Φυλεῖ	ἡ βουλὴ ὁ δῆμος ἱππαρχή- σαντα	5
e	f	g	h	
ἡ βουλὴ ὁ δῆμος στρατη- γήσαντα	ἡ βουλὴ ὁ δῆμος στρατη- γήσαντα	ἡ βουλὴ ὁ δῆμος στρατη- γήσαντα	οἱ ἱππεῖς ἱππαρ- χήσαντα.	10

infra coronas f–g: Σωσίθεος Ἀθηναῖος ἐποίησε.

in latere sinistro:

i	k
Παναθή- ναια τὰ μεγά- λα ἄρματι	Ἐλευσί- νιοι

in latere dextro:

l	m	
Δήλια ἄρματι	Ἑρμαῖα ἄρματι.	13
		15

Ἐλεusine prope Propylaea Appii Claudii, nunc in museo Eleusinio
(Catal. n. 665). Basis quadrata marmoris Pentelici a. 0,70, l. 0,67, cr.
0,47. ... ἢ Dittenberger Syll.³ 319; de titulo cf. Jacoby FGrH II b 644
ad 228 T 3; S. Dow & A.H. Travis, Hesperia 12 (1943) 145–9; Chr.
Habicht Athen 64; et imprimis S.V. Tracy, Boeotia Antiqua 4 (1994) 154–
7; ADT 43–5; 171–4 et in hoc volumine, qui Demetrium in hoc titulo →

VI. NOT ACCEPTED

on the titles *Collection of Forensic Speeches* and *Collection of Sophistical or Epideictic Speeches*, posited by Wehrli p. 37, see 118

162 *Inscriptiones Graecae* II² 2971

[*front*] The Athenians stationed by the people in Eleusis and Panactum and on (the hill of) Phyle have awarded crowns to the commander of the army Demetrius, son of Phanostratus, of Phalerum and have dedicated (them) to Demeter and Kore.

[*front, in crowns a–d, e–h*] (a) The Athenians stationed in Eleusis; (b) The Athenians stationed in Panactum; (c) The Athenians stationed on (the hill of) Phyle;¹ (d) The Council (and) the People (have crowned Demetrius²) as commander of the cavalry; (e) The Council (and) the People as commander of the army; (f) The Council (and) the People as commander of the army; (g) The Council (and) the People as commander of the army; (h) The cavalry as commander of the cavalry.

[*beneath crowns f–g*] Made by Sositheus of Athens.

[*left side, in crowns i–k*] (i) The Great Panathenaic Games (for a victory) with the chariot; (k) The Eleusinians;

[*right side, in crowns l–m*] (l) The Games of Delian Apollo (for a victory) with the chariot; (m) The Games of Hermes (for a victory) with the chariot.³

¹ In crowns *a–c* the formula “have crowned Demetrius” is to be understood; cp. ll. 1–4.

² In crowns *e–h* the formula “have crowned Demetrius” is also to be understood.

³ According to S.V. Tracy (in this volume) the lettering on this base is the work of a letter-cutter who was active in the period c. 270–c. 235 B.C. As a result the Demetrius mentioned here cannot be Demetrius of Phalerum, but must be his grandson of the same name, who was appointed ‘lawgiver’ by Antigonos Gonatas c. 260; cp. 7; 16B note 2; 151 note 1.

laudatum non Demetrium Phalereum sed nepotem eius esse demonstravit; de hoc Demetrio (PA 3453; APF 3455 p. 109), cf. IG II² 1285,1–12 cum SEG 3.123 et Hesperia 47 (1978) no. 8 p. 280–2 = SEG 28.63 et v. 7

- 163** Harpocration, *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos* s.v. Ἰσαῖος (no. 21, 137.10–13 Keaney)

206 W

Ἰσαῖος· εἷς μὲν ἐστὶ τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων οὗτος, μαθητῆς δὲ Ἰσοκράτους, διδάσκαλος δὲ Δημοσθένους, Ἀθηναῖος τὸ γένος, καθά φησιν Ἑρμιππος ἐν β΄ Περὶ τῶν Ἰσοκράτους μαθητῶν. Δημήτριος δ' ἐν τοῖς Περὶ ὁμωνύμων ποιητῶν Χαλκιδέα φησὶν αὐτὸν εἶναι. 5

1–5 = *Phot.* s.v. Ἰσαῖος (1.98.25–7 Porson) = *Suda* s.v. Ἰσαῖος (no. 620, LG 1.2.667.15–17 Adler = *Demetr. Magn. F 6b Mejer*) = *Hermipp. F 70 Wehrli* = *Demetr. Magn. F 6a Mejer*

1 μὲν *om. pl* 3 Ἑρμιππος *Val: εὐριπος pl* 3–4 καθά—μαθητῶν *om. Phot., Suda* 4 μαθητῶν *Val: μαθημάτων pl* 4–5 Δημήτριος—ποιητῶν] Δημήτριος δὲ *Phot., Suda*

- 164** Plutarchus, *Demosthenes* 28.3 (BT 1.2.308.16–22 Ziegler)

134 W

τοῦτον δὲ Θούριον ὄντα τῷ γένει λόγος ἔχει τραγωδίας ὑποκρίνεσθαι ποτε, καὶ τὸν Αἰγινήτην Πῶλον τὸν ὑπερβαλόντα τῇ τέχνῃ πάντας ἐκείνου γεγονέναι μαθητὴν ἱστοροῦσιν. Ἑρμιππος δὲ τὸν Ἀρχίαν ἐν τοῖς Λακρίτου τοῦ ῥήτορος μαθηταῖς ἀναγράφει· Δημήτριος 5 δὲ τῆς Ἀναξιμένους διατριβῆς μετεσχηκέναι φησὶν αὐτόν.

4–7 228 F 20 FGrH = *Demetr. Magn. F 5 Mejer*; cf. [*Plu.*] *Vitae X or.* 846F; *sequitur* 28.4 = **13B** 4–5 *Hermipp. F 76 Wehrli*

2 ὑποκρίνασθαι *Reiske* 3 ὑπερβάλλοντα *N* || πάντες *N*

- *165** Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 3.8.20 (3.345.10–346.11 Hense) (F 9 Ostermann), quod Demetrio Phalereo attribuerunt E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, I 128; 130–1 et F. Blass, *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, III.2 346; Demetrio Cynico E. Bayer *DPhA* 117–20; cf. RE 9, 2582–3 s.v. Ioannes Stobaios

- *166** Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 9.21.1–3 (F 34 Ostermann) = Demetrius Judaeus 722 F 1 FGrH

- *167** Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 9.29.1–3 (F 35 Ostermann) = Demetrius Judaeus 722 F 2 FGrH

- 163** Harpocration, *Lexicon on the Ten Attic Orators* under *Isaeus* (no. 21, 137.10–13 Keaney)

Isaeus: This man is one of the Ten Orators, a pupil of Isocrates, and teacher of Demosthenes; Athenian by birth, as Hermippus says in book 2 of *On the pupils of Isocrates*, although Demetrius in his *On poets of the same name* says that he was from Chalcis.¹

¹ On this fragment see Wehrli p. 89 on F 206 and cp. 140; 155–6; 164. It is included by Mejer in the fragments of Demetrius of Magnesia.

- 164** Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 28.3 (BT 1.2.308.16–22 Ziegler)

Of this man (Archias), being a Thurian by birth, it is said that he had once been an actor in tragedies; and it is reported that Polus of Aegina, who surpassed all in the art of acting, had been his pupil. Hermippus lists Archias among the students of the orator Lacritus, Demetrius says that he was a participant in the courses of Anaximenes.¹

¹ On this fragment see Wehrli p. 89 on F 206 and cp. 140; 155–6; 163. It is included by Mejer in the fragments of Demetrius of Magnesia.

- *165** Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.8.20 (3.345.10–346.11 Hense) (F 9 Ostermann), which E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, I 128; 130–1 and F. Blass, *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, III.2 346, attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum; E. Bayer *DPhA* 117–20 to Demetrius the Cynic; cp. *RE* 9, 2582–3 s.v. Ioannes Stobaios
- *166** Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* 9.21.1–3 (F 34 Ostermann) = Demetrius Judaeus 722 F 1 FGrH
- *167** Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* 9.29.1–3 (F 35 Ostermann) = Demetrius Judaeus 722 F 2 FGrH

- *168** Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 9.29.15 (F 36 Ostermann) = Demetrius Judaeus 722 F 4 FGrH
- *169** Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.21.141.1 (F 37 Ostermann) = Demetrius Judaeus 722 F 6 FGrH
- *170** Scholium In Homeri *Iliadem* 6.414 (F 58 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 7 = 48 Staesche
- *171** Scholium In Homeri *Iliadem* 14.221 (F 59 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 15 Staesche
- *172** Scholium In Homeri *Iliadem* 13.5 (F 60 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 14 Staesche
- *173** Scholium In Homeri *Iliadem* 16.411 (F 61 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 18 Staesche
- *174** Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* vol. 3.785 ad 15.680 (F 64 Ostermann) = Demetrius Gonypesos (cf. Montanari in hoc volumine)
- *175** Scholium In Homeri *Odysseam* 18.17 (F 69 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 25 Staesche
- *176** Alexis ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae*, 13.92 610E = F 99 PCG K.-A.

- *168** Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* 9.29.15 (F 36 Ostermann) = Demetrius Judaeus 722 F 4 FGrH
- *169** Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.21.141.1 (F 37 Ostermann) = Demetrius Judaeus 722 F 6 FGrH
- *170** Scholium on Homer's *Iliad* 6.414 (F 58 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 7 = 48 Staesche
- *171** Scholium on Homer's *Iliad* 14.221 (F 59 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 15 Staesche
- *172** Scholium on Homer's *Iliad* 13.5 (F 60 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 14 Staesche
- *173** Scholium on Homer's *Iliad* 16.411 (F 61 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 18 Staesche
- *174** Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer's Iliad* vol. 3.785 on 15.680 (F 64 Ostermann) = Demetrius Gonypesos (cp. Montanari in this volume)
- *175** Scholium on Homer's *Odyssey* 18.17 (F 69 Ostermann) = Demetrius Ixion F 25 Staesche
- *176** Alexis in Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*, 13.92 610E = F 99 PCG K.-A.

CONCORDANCES

The following tables relate the texts collected in this editon (SOD) to that of Wehrli, Basel/Stuttgart 1968, and the partial editions of Jacoby (FGrH), Leiden 1926, Müller (FHG), Paris 1878, and Ostermann, Fulda 1857.

- 1 F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Band 4: *Demetrios von Phaleron*, zweite, ergänzte und verbesserte Auflage, Basel/Stuttgart 1968

Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD
1	14	24	1	49	29	72	57
2	1	25	44	50	30	73	119
2b	4	26	18	51	29	74	1
3	2	27	19	52	1	75	2
4	9A–B	28	1	53	25C	76	80
5	10	29	54	54	25B	77	1
6	1	30	50	55	19	78	1
7	12	31	51	56	31	79	83
8	45	32	52	57	1	80	1
9	43A	33	55A–B	58a	33B	81	82A–B
10	15A	34	43A–B	58b	33A	82	85
11	15B	35	43A	59	32	83	84
12	16B	36	2	60	37	84	1
13	16A	37	5	61	35	85	1
14	17	38	1	62	36	86	1
15	20A	39	6	63	38	87	1
16	56	40	3	64	39	88	1
17	20B; 58A	41	11	65	40	89	1; 113
		42	47	66	59	90	1
18	23A	43	48	67	58B; app.	91	107
19	23D	44	49		59; 61–3	92	106
20	162	45	21	68	1	93	108
21	24A	46	22	69	1	94	105
22	25A	47	26	70	2	95	102
23	24C	48	28	71	42	96	104

Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD
97	103	122VI	76	150	94	179	124
98	109	122VII	77	150I	111	180	125
99	86	123	90	150II	112	181	1
100	1	124	91	151	103	182	126
101	80	125	1	152	92	183	12
102	1	126	1	153	109	184	127
103	1	127	1	154	155	185	128
104	1	128	1	155	114	186	129
105	1	129	1	156	132	187	1
106	1	130	1	157	130	188	62
107	1	131	19	158	131A	189	1
108	1	132	89	159	131B	190	143
109	1	133	156	160	1	191	144
110	80	134	13B; 164	161	137	192	146
111	1	135	53	162	134	193	145
112	1	136	115	163	135A	194	1
113	1	137	110	164	135B	195	133
114	87	138a	116A	165	136	196	147
115	1	138b	116B	166	137	197	1
116	1	139	100	167	139	198	154
117	1; 72	140	99	168	138	199	59
118	1	141a	96A	169	134	200	1
119	1	141b	96B	170	133	201	65
120	1	142	52	171	140	202	66
121	1	143	98	172	141	203	161
122	1	144	97	173	148	204	159; 160
122I	70A	145	95	174	120	205	142
122II	71	146	101	175	121	206	163
122III	73	147	117	176	119	207	157
122IV	74	148	1	177	122	208	158
122V	75	149	93	178	123		
SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli
1	1; 6; 24; 28; 38; 52; 57; 68–9; 74; 77–8; 80; 84–90; 100; 102–9; 111–3; 115–22; 125–9;	2	130; 148; 160; 181; 187; 189; 194; 197; 200 3; 36; 70; 75 40 2b 37 39	9A	4	17	14
				9B	4	18	26
				10	5	19	27; 55;
				11	41		131
				12	7; 183	20A	15
				13B	134	20B	17
				14	1	21	45
				15A	10	22	46
				15B	11	23A	18
				16A	13	23D	19
				16B	12	24A	21

278 Demetrius of Phalerum

SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli	SOD	Wehrli
24C	23	57	72	96B	141b	129	186
25A	22	58A	17	97	144	130	157
25B	54	58B	67	98	143	131A	158
25C	53	59	66; 199	99	140	131B	159
26	47	61	67	100	139	132	156
28	48	62	67; 188	101	146	133	170; 195
29	49; 51	63	67	102	95	134	162; 169
30	50	65	201	103	97; 151	135A	163
31	56	66	202	104	96	135B	164
32	59	70A	122I	105	94	136	165
33A	58b	71	122II	106	92	137	161; 166
33B	58a	72	117	107	91	138	168
35	61	73	122III	108	93	139	167
36	62	74	122IV	109	98; 153	140	171
37	60	75	122V	110	137	141	172
38	63	76	122VI	111	150I	142	205
39	64	77	122VII	112	150II	143	190
40	65	80	76; 101;	113	89	144	191
42	71		110	114	155I	145	193
43A	9; 34; 35	82A	81	115	136	146	192
43B	34	82B	81	116A	138a	147	196
44	25	83	79	116B	138b	148	171
45	8	84	83	117	147	154	198
47	42	85	82	119	73; 176	155	154
48	43	86	99	120	174	156	133
49	44	87	114	121	175	157	207
50	30	89	132	122	177	158	208
51	31	90	123	123	178	159	204
52	32; 142	91	124	124	179	160	204
53	135	92	152	125	180	161	203
54	29	93	149	126	182	162	20
55A	33	94	150	127	184	163	206
55B	33	95	145	128	185	164	134
56	16	96A	141a				

2 F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (FGrH),
Zweiter Teil: *Zeitgeschichte*, B *Spezialgeschichten*, *Autobiographien und Memoiren*. *Zeittafeln*, Leiden 1926, no. 228 p. 956–73

FGrH	SOD	FGrH	SOD	FGrH	SOD	FGrH	SOD
T 1	1; 2	T 3b	19	T 3f	44	T 5	32
T 2a	43A	T 3c	17	T 4a	30	T 6a	35
T 2b	15A	T 3d	20A–B	T 4b	26; 28–9;	T 6b	38
T 3a	16A	T 3e	56		31	T 6c	40

FGrH	SOD	FGrH	SOD	FGrH	SOD	FGrH	SOD
T 6d	1	F 7	98	F 21	113	F 37	84
T 6e	58B; 59; 62; 63	F 8	110	F 22	117	F 38	85
T 7	36	F 9	53	F 23	114	F 39	82A–B
T 8	57	F 10	109	F 24	83	F 40	106
T 9a	119	F 11a	133	F 25	115	F 41	108
T 9b	120–3; 125	F 11b	133	F 26	52	F 42	107
T 9c	126	F 12a	96B	F 27	90	F 43	102
T 10	62	F 12b	96A	F 28	89	F 44	103
T 11	80	F 13	97	F 29	91	F 45a	104
		F 14	134	F 30	140	F 45b	105
		F 15	130	F 31	95	F 46	141
		F 16	135A	F 32a	144	F 47	132
F 1	93	F 17a	137	F 32b	146	F 48a	131A
F 2	94	F 17b	136	F 33	145	F 48b	131B
F 3	92	F 18a	137	F 34	19	F 49	148
F 4	99	F 18b	134	F 35a	116A	F 50	157
F 5	101	F 19	156	F 35b	116B	F 51	65
F 6	100	F 20	164	F 36	155	F 52	66
SOD	FGrH	SOD	FGrH	SOD	FGrH	SOD	FGrH
1	T 1; T 6d	57	T 8	98	F 7	125	T 9b
2	T 1	58B	T 6e	99	F 4	126	T 9c
15A	T 2b	59	T 6e	100	F 6	130	F 15
16A	T 3a	62	T 6e;	101	F 5	131A	F 48a
17	T 3c		T 10	102	F 43	131B	F 48b
19	T 3b;	63	T 6e	103	F 44	132	F 47
	F 34	65	F 51	104	F 45a	133	F 11a;
20A	T 3d	66	F 52	105	F 45b		F 11b
20B	T 3d	80	T 11	106	F 40	134	F 14;
26	T 4b	82A	F 39	107	F 42		F 18b
28	T 4b	82B	F 39	108	F 41	135A	F 16
29	T 4b	83	F 24	109	F 10	136	F 17b
30	T 4a	84	F 37	110	F 8	137	F 17a;
31	T 4b	85	F 38	113	F 21		F 18a
32	T 5	89	F 28	114	F 23	140	F 30
35	T 6a	90	F 27	115	F 25	141	F 46
36	T 7	91	F 29	116A	F 35a	144	F 32a
38	T 6b	92	F 3	116B	F 35b	145	F 33
40	T 6c	93	F 1	117	F 22	146	F 32b
43A	T 2a	94	F 2	119	T 9a	148	F 49
44	T 3f	95	F 31	120	T 9b	155	F 36
52	F 26	96A	F 12b	121	T 9b	156	F 192
53	F 9	96B	F 12a	122	T 9b	157	F 50
56	T 3e	97	F 13	123	T 9b	164	F 20

3 C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, Vol. II, Paris 1878, p. 362–9

FHG	SOD	FHG	SOD	FHG	SOD	FHG	SOD
1	93	6	100	11	97	16	135A
2	94	7	98	12	52	17	137
3	92	8	117	13	113	18	164
4	99	9	95	14	102	19	82A
5	101	10	96A–B	15	104		
SOD	FHG	SOD	FHG	SOD	FHG	SOD	FHG
52	12	95	9	99	4	113	13
82A	19	96A	10	100	6	117	8
92	3	96B	10	101	5	135A	16
93	1	97	11	102	14	137	17
94	2	98	7	104	15	164	18

4 Chr. Ostermann, *De Demetrii Phalerei vita, rebus gestis et scriptorum reliquiis*, Part. II, Programm Fulda 1857, p. 21–48

Ostermann	SOD	Ostermann	SOD	Ostermann	SOD	Ostermann	SOD
1	108	19	94	37	169	55	129
2	107	20	109	38	90	56	147
3	102	21	102	39	91	57	148
4	102	22	103	40	1	58	170
5	104	23	92	41	113	59	171
6	1	24	96B	42	116A–B	60	172
7	1	25	98	43	133	61	173
8	1	26	99	44	136	62	157
9	165	27	101	45	135A	63	143
10	154	28	100	46	137	64	174
11	1	29	95	47	137	65	160
12	1	30	117	48	134	66	146
13	83	31	1	49	134	67	144
14	82A–B	32	97	50	164	68	145
15	1	33	12	51	156	69	175
16	85	34	166	52	140	70	87
17	84	35	167	53	163	71	59
18	93	36	168	54	128		

SOD	Ostermann	SOD	Ostermann	SOD	Ostermann	SOD	Ostermann
1	6–8; 11; 12; 15; 31; 40	95	29	117	30	156	51
		96B	24	128	54	157	62
		97	32	129	55	160	65
12	33	98	25	133	43	163	53
59	71	99	26	134	48; 49	164	50
82A	14	100	28	135A	45	165	9
82B	14	101	27	136	44	166	34
83	13	102	3; 4; 21	137	46; 47	167	35
84	17	103	22	140	52	168	36
85	16	104	5	143	63	169	37
87	70	107	2	144	67	170	58
90	38	108	1	145	68	171	59
91	39	109	20	146	66	172	60
92	23	113	41	147	56	173	61
93	18	116A	42	148	57	174	64
94	19	116B	42	154	10	175	69

INDEX OF DEMETRIAN TEXTS EITHER PRINTED
OR ENTERED IN THE APPARATUS
OR IN A SEPARATE LIST

The numbers in bold refer to the fragments. *Iudicia* refers to 'I. Life: Demetrius Legislator: Judgments'; *Dicta* to 'II. Sayings'; *Religio* and *Carmina* to 'III. Writings: Religion' and 'III. Writings: Songs'.

AELIANUS, CLAUDIUS (saec. 2–3 pCn)	APOSTOLIUS (saec. 15 pCn)
<i>Varia Historia</i>	12.27 ^d (CPG 2.246.13–14
3.17 (BT 46.26; 47.24–9 Dilts) 40	Leutsch) app. 38
9.9 (BT 103.23–104.8) 43B	APPENDIX VATICANA
12.43 (BT 143.14–18) 4	I 49 (176.4–6 Sternbach) app. 38
ALEXIS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	ARETHAS PATRENSIS (saec. 9–
ap. Athenaeum, <i>Deipnosophistae</i>	10 pCn)
13.92 610E (BT 3.347.9–13	<i>Epistulae</i>
Kaibel) 176	39 (BT 1.295.1–13
AMMONIUS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 5 pCn)	Westerink) Dicta no.13; 70B
<i>In Aristotelis De interpretatione</i>	ARISTEAS (saec. 3 aCn/1 pCn)
<i>commentarius</i>	<i>Epistula ad Philocratem</i>
4.5.4.29–31 Busse = DEMETRIUS	9–11; 28; 29–32; 301–3; 308–9;
RHETOR 159	312–17 (BT 3.11–4.9; 10.11–12;
AMPELIUS, LUCIUS (saec. 4 pCn?)	10.19–12.5; 79.23–80.11;
<i>Liber Memorialis</i>	81.8–15; 82.6–83.14 Wendland) 59
15.19 (BT 31.10–13 Assmann) 24B	ARISTOBULUS JUDAEUS (saec. 2 aCn)
ANECDOTA GRAECA OXONIENSIA	ap. Clementem Alexandrinum,
Cramer → DIOGENIANUS; SCHOLIA	<i>Stromata</i> 1.22.150.1–3 (GCS
ANECDOTA GRAECA PARISIENSIA	2.92.27–93.10 Stählin-
Cramer → SYMEON	Früchtel) app. 60
ANONYMUS CRAMERI (saec. 15 pCn)	ap. Eusebium, <i>Praeparatio</i>
SA XIc, 1.1A p. 43.4–9 Koster =	<i>Evangelica</i> 13.12.1–2 (GCS
CGF VI Pb 4–10 Kaibel app. 58B	8.2.190.16–191.7 Mras) 60
ANONYMUS MATRITENSIS (saec. 10–	ARISTOCLES (saec. 2–1 aCn)
11 pCn)	ap. Athenaeum, <i>Deipnosophistae</i>
39.10–12 Bauer app. 39	14.12 620B (BT 3.367.15–18
ANONYMUS SEGUERIANUS (saec. 3 pCn)	Kaibel) 55A
<i>Ars rhetorica</i>	ARRIANUS, FLAVIUS (saec. 1–2 pCn)
125–8 (RhGr 1.373.21–374.9	<i>Historia successorum Alexandri</i>
Hammer = 1.442.13–25	ap. Photium, <i>Bibliotheca</i> 92 69b
Spengel) 127	34–40 (CB 2.22.30–23.5 Henry) 13A
ANTONIUS MELISSA (saec. 11–12 pCn)	ARSENIUS (saec. 15–16 pCn)
<i>Loci communes</i>	<i>Violetum</i>
1.70 (PG 136.984B.19–20	134.22–136.4 Walz = DEMETRIUS
Migne) app. 73	SCEPSIUS app. 157

187.7–18	app. 1	2.1.59.12–21	app. 143
187.19–20	app. 1	2.1.90.9–16	app. 116B
187.21–188.10	app. 87 (Cleob.)	2.1.95.12–17; 17–19	app. 153
188.11–15	app. 1	2.1.115.1–4	app. 51
188.13–15	app. 72	2.2.30.3–5	app. 33A
188.16–17	app. 73	2.2.92.34–93.12	app. 43A
188.18	app. 1	2.2.119.9	app. 5
188.18–22	app. 38	2.2.127.32–4	app. 55A
297.17–23	app. 48	AURELIUS, MARCUS → MARCUS	
ARTEMIDORUS DALDIANUS (saec.		AURELIUS	
2 pCn)		CEDRENUS → GEORGIUS CEDRENUS	
<i>Onirocriticon</i>		CHOEROBOSCUS → GEORGIUS	
2.44 (BT 179.11–18 Pack) 81 no.3; 86		CHOEROBOSCUS	
ASCLEPIADES (4–3 aCn)		CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS (106–43 aCn)	
ap. Athenaeum, <i>Deipnosophistae</i>		<i>Brutus</i>	
13.21 567C–D (BT 3.250.22–4;		9.37–8 (BT 4.11.4–16 Malcovati)	
250.26–251.4 Kaibel)	3	8 no.3; 121	
ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (2–3 pCn)		82.285 (BT 4.88.10–19)	122
<i>Deipnosophistae</i>		<i>De Divinatione</i>	
4.64 167D–F (BT 1.377.14–		2.46.96 (BT 46.122.22–123.4	
378.3 Kaibel) = HEGESANDER	7	Giomini)	138
5.4 177C–178A (BT 1.407.24–		<i>De Finibus</i>	
408.10; 408.22–409.7)		5.19.53–4 (BT 13.182.22–183.11	
Dicta no.33; 143		Schiche)	8 no.4; 36
6.23 233D–E (BT 2.24.4–14)		<i>De Legibus</i>	
Dicta no.29; 30; 116B		2.25.62–27.67 (HT 20.83.25–	
6.45–6 245A–C (BT		85.23 Ziegler-Görler)	53
2.47.7–48.4)	153	3.6.14 (HT 20.95.4–25)	8 no.2; 57
6.103 272C (BT 2.104.18–24)		<i>De Officiis</i>	
= CTESICLES	51	1.1.3 (OCT 2.4–16	
10.19 422C–D (BT 2.418.19–		Winterbottom)	8 no.5; 119
22) = SOSICRATES	33A	2.17.60 (OCT 95.22–96.4)	110
12.60 542B–543A (BT 3.195.18–		<i>De Oratore</i>	
197.10)	43A	2.23.95 (BT 3.143.4–10	
13.2 555D–556B (BT 3.225.25–		Kumaniecki)	120
226.13)	105	<i>De Republica</i>	
13.21 567C–D (BT 3.250.22–4;		2.1.2 (CB 2.7.10–8.9 Bréguet)	56
250.26–251.4) = ASCLEPIADES	3	<i>Orator</i>	
13.65 593E–F (BT 3.308.22–		26.91–2; 94–6 (BT 5.27.6–14;	
309.2) = DIYLLUS	5	28.9–29.2 Westman)	124
13.92 610E (BT 3.347.9–13) =		<i>Pro Rabirio Postumo</i>	
ALEXIS	176	9.23 (BT 25.60.16–61.1	
14.12 620B (BT 3.367.15–18) =		Olechowska)	42
ARISTOCLES	55A	<i>Epistulae ad Familiares</i>	
<i>Deipnosophistarum Epitome</i>		16.22.2 (BT 603.13–20	
2.1.55.20–30 Peppink	app. 7	Shackleton Bailey)	Iudicia

- CICERO, QUINTUS TULLIUS (saec. 1 aCn)
Commentariolum Petitionis
 2–3 (BT 145.16–24 Shackleton Bailey) **139**
- CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 2–3 pCn)
Stromata
 1.21.141.1 (GCS 2.87.17–24 Stählin-Früchtel) = DEMETRIUS JUDAEUS **169**
 1.22.148.1 (GCS 2.92.5–9) **61**
 1.22.150.1–3 (GCS 2.92.27–93.10) = ARISTOBULUS app. **60**
- CODICES
 Baroccianus 143 f. 191b = MELISSA AUGUSTANA app. **38**
 Barberinus 3.8 f. 186^v app. **72**
 Palatinus 122 f. 212^r no.206 app. **73**
 Palatinus 297 f. 118^r no.69 app. **77**
 Vallicellanus F 58 f. 187^r app. **72**
 Vaticanus 739 = MAXIMUS CONFESSOR app. **73**
- COMOEDIA, PROLEGOMENA DE → ANONYMUS CRAMERI; SCHOLIA; TZETZES
- CORPUS PARISINUM
 476 app. **38**
- COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES (saec. 6 pCn)
Topographia Christiana
 12 460B (330.21–7 Winstedt) app. **59**
- CTESICLES ATHENIENSIS (saec. 2–1 aCn)
 ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae*
 6.103 272C (BT 2.104.18–24 Kaibel) **51**
- CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS (saec. 4 pCn)
Catechesis IV De decem dogmatibus
 34 (PG 33.497.5–9; 15–19 Migne) app. **59**
- DEMETRIUS CHLORUS (saec. 1 aCn) → STEPHANUS BYZANTIUS
- DEMETRIUS CYNICUS (saec. 1 pCn) → STOBAEUS
- DEMETRIUS GONYPESOS (ante saec. 2 pCn) → EUSTATHIUS
- DEMETRIUS IXION (saec. 2 aCn) → SCHOLIA
- DEMETRIUS JUDAEUS (saec. 3 aCn) → CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS; EUSEBIUS
- DEMETRIUS MAGNESIUS (saec. 1 aCn) → HARPOCRATION; PHOTIUS; PLUTARCHUS; SUDA
- DEMETRIUS RHETOR (saec. 1 aCn/1 pCn?)
De Elocutione (BT 3.1–62.25 Radermacher) **118; 159**
 289 (BT 59.4–12) **12**; Dicta no.10 → AMMONIUS; JOANNES SICULUS; PHOEBAMMON; SCHOLIA
- DEMETRIUS RHETOR (saec. 2/1 aCn)
Formae epistolicae (BT 1.1–12.23 Weichert) **118; 149; 161**
- DEMETRIUS SCEPSIUS (saec. 3–2 aCn) → ARSENIUS; SCHOLIA
- DICTA SEPTEM SAPIENTIUM a Demetrio Phalereo collecta
 ap. Stobaeum, *Anthologium* 3.1.172 (3.111.8–125.2 Hense) Dicta; **87**
 [DIO CHRYSOSTOMUS] (saec. 1–2 pCn) → FAVORINUS
- DIODORUS SICULUS (saec. 1 aCn)
Bibliotheca historica
 18.74.1–3 (BT 4.424.21–425.13 Fischer) **16A**
 19.68.2–3 (BT 5.109.5; 8–16) **21**
 19.78.3–5 (BT 5.126.4–17) **22**
 19.81.3–4 (BT 5.130.5–16) app. **2**
 20.27.1 (BT 5.211.1–3) **23D**
 20.45.1–5 (BT 5.239.3–6; 239.9–240.7) **30**
 31.10 (BT 6.12.13–13.8) Dicta no.24; **81** no.1; **82B**
- DIOGENES LAERTIUS (saec. 3 pCn)
Vitae Philosophorum
 1.22 (OCT 1.9.3–7 Long) **88** no.6; **93**
 2.7 (OCT 1.59.26–60.7) **88** no.6; **94**
 2.13 (OCT 1.62.8–15) **81** no.2; **85**
 2.44 (OCT 1.75.10–17) **109**
 2.101 (OCT 1.99.13–20) **48**

4.14 (OCT 1.172.6–10) =		9.2 (CB 5.133.11–15; 134.5–8)	23E
MYRONIANUS	49	<i>Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum</i>	
5.39 (OCT 1.216.7–9)	10	1.15–2.2; 2.6 (CB 5.82.5–83.5;	
5.75 (OCT 1.236.21–22)	8 no.7	84.2–13 Aujac)	Dicta no.32; 133
5.75–83 (OCT 1.236.20–241.2)	1	DIYLLUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
5.76 (OCT 1.237.12–13)	Religio;	ap. Athenaeum, <i>Deipnosophistae</i>	
	Carmina	13.65 593E–F (BT 3.308.22–	
5.79 (OCT 1.238.15)	Dicta no.1	309.2 Kaibel)	5
5.80 (OCT 1.238.23–239.6)		EPIPHANIUS CONSTANTIENSIS (saec. 4	
	88 nos.4; 5; 7; 9;	pCn)	
	10; 11; 118 nos.1; 2; 5; 7	<i>De LXX Interpretibus</i>	
5.81 (OCT 1.239.7–		373 ^a –376 ^b (PG 43.373.1–	
240.12)	81 nos.1; 2; 5; 6; 7;	376.18 Migne)	app. 59
	8; 9; 10; 11; 88 nos.1;	<i>De mensuribus et ponderibus</i>	
	2; 3; 8; 12; 13; 14;	9–11 (168.256–171.329	
	15; 16; 17; 18; 19;	Moutsoulas)	app. 59
	20; 118 nos.4; 6; 7; 8;	PS.-EUDOCIA AUGUSTA	
	9; 10; 11; 149 no.1;	<i>Violarium</i>	
	150 nos.2; 3; 4; 5;	329 (BT 238.15–17	
	6; 7; 8; 9	Flach)	88 no.13; app. 107
5.82 (OCT 1.240.14–24)		EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS (saec. 4 pCn)	
	Dicta nos.2; 3; 4; 5;	<i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>	
	6; 7; 8; app. 72	8.2.1–4 (GCS 8.1.421.3–16	
5.83 (OCT 1.240.24–		Mras)	app. 59
241.2)	Dicta no.9	8.2.5 (GCS 8.1.421.18–19;	
5.83–5 (OCT 1.241.3–242.4)	app. 1	422.3–4)	app. 59
6.90 (OCT 2.287.24–6)	33B	8.3.1–4 (GCS 8.1.422.7–24)	app. 59
9.15 (OCT 2.443.24–7)	88 no.13; 106	8.5.7–10 (GCS 8.1.426.6–	
9.20 (OCT 2.446.24–447.3)		427.2)	app. 59
	81 no.2; 84	9.6.6–8 (GCS 8.1.493.7–18	
9.37 (OCT 2.456.6–7)	88 no.13; 108	Mras)	app. 60
9.57 (OCT 2.467.13–17)	88 no.13;	9.21.1–3 (GCS 8.1.508.7–22)	
	107	= DEMETRIUS JUDAEUS	166
DIOGENIANUS HERACLEENSIS (saec. 2		9.29.1–3 (GCS 8.1.528.2–18)	
pCn)		= DEMETRIUS JUDAEUS	167
ap. Georgium Choeroboscum, <i>Or-</i>		9.29.15 (GCS 8.1.536.22–6)	
<i>thographia</i> (An. Ox. II 239.13–15)	6	= DEMETRIUS JUDAEUS	168
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS (saec. 1		9.42.1–3 (GCS 8.1.553.16–	
aCn)		554.5)	app. 65
<i>De Demosthenis dictione</i>		13.12.1–2 (GCS 8.2.190.16–	
5.1; 5–6 (CB 2.54.20–3;		191.7) = ARISTOBULUS	60
56.1–10 Aujac)	app. 133	EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS (saec.	
53.1; 3–4 (CB 2.152.6–8; 18–27)	136	12 pCn)	
<i>De Dinarcho</i>		<i>Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem</i>	
2.2 (CB 5.124.9–12 Aujac)	9A	2.408 (1.376.25–377.3	
3.4–5 (CB 5.126.11–22) =		van der Valk)	app. 143
PHILOCHORUS	31	2.408 (1.377.3–4)	app. 143

- 15.680 (3.785.11–14) =
 DEMETRIUS GONYPESOS **174**
 24.482 (4.937.18–24) **55B**
- Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*
 1.140 (1.36.12–13
 Stallbaum) app. **43A**
 3.267 (1.125.27–38) app. **144**
 4.89 (1.151.43–152.2) app. **116B**
 5.252 (1.213.1–3) app. **7**
 6.163 (1. 247.8–10) app. **43A**
 20.150 (2.231.43–232.1) app. **43A**
- EXCERPTA CONSTANTINI
 PORPHYROGENITI (saec. 10 pCn)
De sententiis
 125 (4.194.27–195.24
 Boissevain) **81** no.1; app. **82A**
 148 (4.202.8–15) app. **91**
 360 (4.373.1–22) **81** no.1; app. **82B**
- De Virtutibus et Vitiis*
 173 (2.1.249.12–21 Büttner-
 Wobst) app. **2**
 41 (2.2.129.24–7; 130.10–
 131.4 Roos) app. **89**
- FAVORINUS ARELATENSIS (saec. 2 pCn)
Corinthiaca
 41 (F 95 p. 311.16–20
 Barigazzi) = [Dio Chrysos-
 tomus], *Orationes* 37.41
 (2.27.6–10 von Arnim) **25C**
- FLORILEGIUM LEIDENSE
 175 (28.1–2 Beynen) app. **78**
 176 (28.3–5) app. **74**
 177 (28.6–7) app. **79**
- FLORILEGIUM MONACENSE
 186 (BT 4.281.24–5
 Meineke) Dicta no.21; **78**
 187 (BT 4.281.26–28) app. **74**
 188 (BT 4.282.1–2) Dicta no.22; **79**
- GEORGIUS CEDRENUS (saec. 11 pCn)
Historiarum Compendium
 165B–C (CSHB 1.289.18–
 290.11 Bekker) app. **59**
- GEORGIUS CHOEROBOSCUS (saec. 9 pCn)
Orthographia
 An. Ox. II 239.13–15 =
 DIOGENIANUS **6**
- GEORGIUS MONACHUS (saec. 9 pCn)
Chronicon breve
 104.2 (PG 110.348.18–34
 De Muralto) app. **59**
- GEORGIUS SYNCCELLUS (saec. 8–9 pCn)
Ecloga Chronographica
 p. 517 Dindorf (BT 328.16–22
 Mosshammer) **64**
 p. 518 Dindorf (BT 329.3–8) **58A**
 p. 521 Dind. (BT 331.6–7) **20B**
- GNOMICA BASILEENSIA (fort. saec.
 11 pCn)
 276 (91.28–9 Kindstrand) app. **73**
- GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM 743 (saec.
 14 pCn)
 no.253 (99.1–2 Sternbach)
 Dicta no.12; **70A**
 no.254 (99.8–9) Dicta no.14; **71**;
 Religio
 no.255 (99.14–16) Dicta no.15; **72**
 no.256 (100.1–2) Dicta no.16; **73**
 no.257 (100.8–9) Dicta no.17; **74**
 no.258 (100.13–14) Dicta no.18; **75**
 no.259 (100.18–19) Dicta no.19; **76**
 no.260 (101.8) Dicta no.20; **77**
- GREGORIUS CORINTHIUS (saec. 12 pCn)
 in Hermogenis *De Methodo* VIII 71
 (RhG 7.2.1180.11–20 Walz) app. **12**
- HARPOCRATION (saec. 2 pCn)
Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos
 s.v. Ἐρκειος Ζεύς (no.134,
 112.3–8 Keaney) **88** no.7; **100**
 s.v. Ἰσαῖος (no.21, 137.10–
 13) = DEMETRIUS MAGNESIUS **163**
 s.v. παράστασις (no.31, 206.
 23–207.7) **88** no.7; **98**
 s.v. σκαφηφόροι (no.21, 236.
 15–21) **88** no.7; **101**
- HEGESANDER DELPHICUS (saec. 3 aCn)
 ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae*
 4.64 167D–F (BT 1.377.14–
 378.3 Kaibel) **7**
- PS.-HESYCHIUS MILESIUS (saec. 6 pCn)
 19 (BT 15.18–20 Flach) app. **2**
 35 (BT 29.7–10) app. **48**
 50 (BT 40.12–16) app. **49**

HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS (c. 350–420 pCn)		LEO GRAMMATICUS (saec. 10–11 pCn)	
<i>Interpretatio Chronicorum Eusebii</i>		<i>Chronographia</i>	
ad Ol. 115,1 (GCS 24, p. 126.2–3 Helm)	14	49.21–50.17 CSHB Bekker	app. 59
ad Ol. 118,1–4 (GCS 24, p. 127.3–6)	39	LEXICON RHETORICUM CANTABRIGIENSE (saec. 14 pCn)	
INSCRIPTIONES		s.v. εἰσαγγελία (14.4–19 Houtsma)	96B
<i>The Athenian Agora</i>		s.v. κυρία ἐκκλησία (19.19–20)	88 no.7; 99
XIX, H 84	23B	s.v. μὴ οὔσα δίκη (21.4–19)	97
<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>		s.v. παράστασις (67.9–20)	88 no.7; app. 98
II ² 1201	16B	MARCELLINUS (saec. 4 pCn?)	
II ² 2971	162	<i>Vita Thucydidis</i>	
<i>Marmor Parium</i> (264/3 aCn)		32 (SGL 1.8.4–16 Alberti)	88 no.6; 92
B 15–16, Ep. 13 (FGrH II B 1003.25–7 Jacoby)	20A	MARCUS AURELIUS (saec. 2 pCn)	
B 22–4, Ep. 19 (FGrH II B 1004.9–12)	23A	<i>Ad se ipsum</i>	
B 24–5, Ep. 20 (FGrH II B 1004.13–15)	26	9.29 (BT 89.8–19 Dalfen)	68
<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>		MAXIMUS CONFESSOR (c. 580–662 pCn)	
20.716	app. 151	<i>Loci communes</i>	
25.206	152	3 (PG 91.744B.18–21 Combefis)	app. 72
27.1194, 28–9	151	16 (PG 91.817.22–4)	app. 38
30.325, no.2	46	18.45 (cod. Vat. Gr. 739)	app. 73
35.136	23C	MELISSA AUGUSTANA	
<i>Tabula Rhodiensis</i> (exeunte saec. 2 aCn)		29 (Bar. 143 f. 191b)	app. 38
col. I 1–7 (215.1–7 RFIC 63 [1935] Segre)	80; 88 nos.7; 9; 16; 17; 118 no.3; 150 no.1	MONACHUS → GEORGIUS MONACHUS	
JOANNES SICULUS (saec. 11 pCn)		MYRONIANUS AMASTRIANUS (post saec. 2 pCn)	
<i>Prolegomena in Hermogenis</i> Περὶ Ἰδεῶν		ap. Diogenem Laertium, <i>Vitae Philosophorum</i> 4.14 (OCT 1. 172.6–10 Long)	49
RhGr 14.410.12 Rabe =		NEPOS, CORNELIUS (c. 99–c. 24 aCn)	
DEMETRIUS RHETOR	159	<i>Miltiades</i>	
JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS (saec. 1 pCn)		6.2–4 (BT 5.26–6.6 Marshall)	24A
<i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>		<i>Phocion</i>	
12.12–16 (3.74.22–75.16 Niese)	app. 59	3.1–2 (BT 73.4–10 Marshall)	15B
12.34; 35 (3.78.20–2; 79.4–5)	app. 59	NONIUS MARCELLUS (saec. 4 pCn)	
12.36–9 (3.79.5–24)	app. 59	<i>De Conpendiosa Doctrina</i>	
12.103–5 (3.90.2–11)	app. 59	XII (BT 3.848.22–849.2 Lindsay)	24C
12.107–8 (3.90.18–25)	app. 59	PAPYRI	
12.110–4 (3.91.8–92.3)	app. 59	<i>PHerc.</i> → PHILODEMUS	
<i>Contra Apionem</i>		<i>PLille</i> 88 (CPF I 1** 42 1T, p. 3–4 Linguiti)	41
1.215–18 (5.38.20–39.2 Niese)	65		
2.45–7 (5.60.2–15)	63		

- PSI 2.144.1–19 (PSI 2.70–1 Vitelli) **135C**
- PSI Inv. CNR 70 (inedita) **81**
- PAUSANIAS PERIEGETA (saec. 2 pCn) app. **9B**
- Graeciae descriptio*
- 1.25.6 (BT 1.56.31–57.8 Rocha–Pereira) **17**
- PHAEDRUS, GAIUS IULIUS (c. 15 aCn–50 pCn)
- Fabulae Aesopiae*
- 5.1 (CSLP 79 Guaglianone) **44**
- PHILOCHORUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 4–3 aCn)
- ap. Dionysium Halicarnassensem, *De Dinarcho* 3.4–5 (CB 5.126.11–22 Aujac) **31**
- PHILODEMUS (ineunte saec. 1 aCn)
- De Rhetorica*
- PHerc.* 224, fr. 12.1–12 (BT 2.173 Sudhaus) **131C**
- PHerc.* 453, fr. 4.1–16 (p. 67 Crönert) **8** no.1; **131B**
- PHerc.* 1004, col. 48.1–15 (BT 1.346 Sudhaus) **118** no.5; **132**
- PHerc.* 1004, col. 55.3–16 (BT 1.350) **131A**
- PHerc.* 1004, col. 101, 6–16 (BT 1.377–8) **37**
- PHerc.* 1007, col. 15a.20–18a.8 (BT 1.197–200) **134**
- PHerc.* 1007, col. 40a.24–42a.4 (BT 1.221–2) **130**
- PHerc.* 1015, fr. 6.1–7 (BT 1.272) **118** no.5; **141**
- PHerc.* 1015, fr. 23.10–15 (BT 1.279) **142**
- PHOEBAMMON ANTINOUPOLITANUS (saec. 5/6 pCn?)
- Prolegomena in Hermogenis* Περὶ Ἰδεῶν
- RhGr 14.377.12–13 Rabe = DEMETRIUS RHETOR **159**
- PHOTIUS (saec. 9 pCn)
- Bibliotheca*
- 92 69b34–40 (CB 2.22.30–23.5 Henry) = ARRIANUS **13A**
- 167 114a30 (CB 2.155.21) Dicta
- 265 493a42–b16 (CB 8.63.19–64.8) **135B**
- 267 496b8–13 (CB 8.72.24–9) app. **9B**
- Lexicon*
- s.v. Ἰσαῖος (1.98.25–7 Porson) = DEMETRIUS MAGNESIUS app. **163**
- s.v. παράστασις (2.336.15–27) **88** no.7; app. **98**
- s.v. σκαφηφόροι (2.446.17–24) **88** no.7; app. **101**
- PLINIUS SECUNDUS, GAIUS (23/24–79 pCn)
- Naturalis Historia*
- 34.12.27 (CB 117.12–16 Le Bonniec) **25A**
- PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (saec. 1–2 pCn)
- Aristides*
- 1.1–4; 6; 7; 8–9 (BT 1.1.249.1–20; 250.9–11; 250.19–20; 250.23–251.3 Ziegler) **88** no.13; **102**
- 5.9–10 (BT 1.1. 256.16–23) **103**
- 27.3–5 (BT 1.1. 286.12–287.3) **88** no.13; **104**
- Demetrius*
- 8.4–9.3 (BT 3.1.9.5–10.9 Ziegler) **29**
- 10.2 (BT 3.1.11.20–5) **18**
- Demosthenes*
- 9.1–4 (BT 1.2.288.5–7; 288.17–289.4 Ziegler) **135A**
- 11.1–3 (BT 1.2.290.7–27) **137**
- 14.1–2 (BT 1.2.293.19–294.1) **156**
- 28.3 (BT 1.2.308.16–22) = DEMETRIUS MAGNESIUS **164**
- 28.4 (BT 1.2.308.22–8) **13B**
- Lycurgus*
- 23.1–2 (BT 3.2.36.18–28 Ziegler) **113**
- Phocion*
- 35.4–5 (BT 2.1.29.26–30.3 Ziegler) **15A**
- Solon*
- 23.3–4 (BT 1.1.110.14–24 Ziegler) **117**

<i>Theseus</i>		12.13.1; 6–12 (BT 3.193.22–194.2; 194.14–195.15)	89
23.1 (BT 1.1.20.13–20 Ziegler)	114		
<i>Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur</i>		29.21 (BT 4.259.20–261.10)	
28 69C–D (BT 1.138.18–139.1 Gärtner)	32	Dicta no.23; 81 no.1; 82A 36.2.1–4 (BT 4.438.9–18)	91
<i>De tuenda sanitate praecepta</i>		QUINTILIANUS (30/40–c. 100 pCn)	
24 135C (BT 1.278.16–22 Gärtner)	8 no.9; 67	<i>Institutio Oratoria</i> 2.4.41–2 (OCT 1.87.10–17 Winterbottom)	126
<i>Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata</i>		10.1.33 (OCT 2.574.5–12)	123
189D (BT 2.54.12–16 Nachstädt et al.)	38; Dicta no.11	10.1.80 (OCT 2.583.18–24)	125
<i>De gloria Atheniensium</i>		RUTILIUS LUPUS (ineunte saec. 1 pCn)	
6 349A–B (BT 2.131.1–3; 4–6; 10–18 Nachstädt)	115	<i>De figuris</i> 1.1 (5.1–4; 9–14 Brooks)	Dicta no.31; 129
<i>De exilio</i>		2.16 (41.1–4; 7; 15–17; 19–26)	128
7 601F–602A (BT 3.518.11–21 Paton et al.)	35	SCHOLIA	
<i>Praecepta gerendae reipublicae</i>		Arethae in Platonis <i>Phaedonem</i> 59E (424.15–21 Greene)	app. 52
24 818C–D (BT 5.1.108.8–11; 14–21 Hubert)	50	in Aristophanis	
27 820E (BT 5.1.114.3–11)	25B	<i>Nubes</i> 37 (SA 1.3.1.256.11–20 Koster)	95
[PLUTARCHUS]		<i>Ranas</i> 1196 (307.14–20 Dübner)	112
<i>Consolatio ad Apollonium</i>		<i>Vespas</i> 240a (SA 2.1.45.11–16 Koster)	111
6 104A–B (BT 1.213.1–8 Gärtner)	Dicta no.25; 83	in Homeri <i>Iliadem</i> 6.35 (ed. Janus Lascaris [D])	
<i>Vitae decem oratorum</i>		(AD) = DEMETRIUS SCEPSIUS	157
850B–C (BT 5.2.1.43.11–17 Mau)	9B	6.35 (1.228.1–10 Dindorf) (A)	
POLLUX, JULIUS (saec. 2 pCn)		= DEMETRIUS SCEPSIUS	app. 157
<i>Onomasticon</i>		6.414 (2.201.48–9 Erbse) (A)	
8.51–3 (LG 9.2.120.22–121.10 Bethe)	96A	= DEMETRIUS IXION	170
8.102 (LG 9.2.133.1–7)	52	13.5 (3.392.66) (AT) =	
POLYAENUS MACEDO (saec. 2 pCn)		DEMETRIUS IXION	172
<i>Strategemata</i>		14.221 (3.610.23–4) (A) =	
3.15 (BT 155.23–156.2 Woelfflin & Melber)	45	DEMETRIUS IXION	171
4.7.6 (BT 201.1–16)	28	16.411 (4.254.31–4) (T) =	
<i>Excerpta Polyaeni</i>		DEMETRIUS IXION	173
52.4 (BT 491.21–2 Woelfflin & Melber)	app. 45	in Homeri <i>Odyseam</i> 3.267 (1.143.15–144.6 Dindorf)	144
POLYBIUS MEGALOPOLITANUS (c. 200–118 aCn)		18.17 (2.654.24–5) =	
<i>Historiae</i>		DEMETRIUS IXION	175
10.24.3–7 (BT 3.88.24–89.14 Büttner-Wobst)	Dicta no.26; 90	Plautinum in codice Vat. Lat. 11.469 (SA XIId, 1.1A p. 48.6–49.1 Koster)	app. 58B

- ad Tzetzae *Allegorias Iliadis*
16, 371–3 (*An. Ox.* 3.384.29–30
Cramer) = DEMETRIUS RHETOR **160**
- ad Tzetzae *Chiliadas* 5.209 (*An.*
Ox. 3.365.25–8 Cramer) **118** no.5;
148
- SOSICRATES RHODIUS (saec. 2 aCn)
ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae*
10.19 422C–D (BT 2.418.19–
22 Kaibel) **33A**
- STEPHANUS BYZANTIUS (saec. 6 pCn)
Ethnica
s.v. Κορόπη (1.375.8–376.4 Mein-
eke) = DEMETRIUS CHLORUS **158**
- STESICLIDES → CTESICLES
- STOBAEUS, JOANNES (saec. 5 pCn)
Anthologium
3.1.172 (3.111.8–125.2 Hense)
= DICTA SEPTEM SAPIENTIUM
Dicta; **81** no.4; **87**
3.12.18 (3.446.16–447.2)
Dicta no.34; **154**
3.5.43 (3.269.5–9) **145**
3.8.20 (3.345.10–346.11) =
DEMETRIUS CYNICUS? **165**
4.7.27 (4.255.10–14) app. **38**; Dicta
- STRABO (saec. 1 aCn–1 pCn)
Geographica
3.2.9 (CB 2.42.4–43.6; 43.20
Lasserre) Dicta no.27;
no.28; **116A**
9.1.20 (CB 6.65.13–66.17
Baladié) **8** no.6; **19**;
88 no.9
- SUDA (exeunte saec. 10 p.Cn)
Lexicon
s.v. βάνανσος (no.93, LG
1.1.452.27–30 Adler) app. **89**
s.v. Δημήτριος (no.429, LG
1.2.40.21–41.2) **2**; **8** no.8
s.v. Δημήτριος (no.429, LG
1.2.41.2–10) app. **2**
s.v. Δημήτριος ὁ Ἀντιγόνου
(no.431, LG 1.2.41.23–8) **27**
s.v. ἐστρατήγησε μετ' Ἑρασι-
νάδου (no.3234, LG 1.2.430.
29–431.3) app. **112**
- s.v. Ἰσαῖος (no.620, LG
1.2.667.15–17) = DEMETRIUS
MAGNESIUS app. **163**
s.v. κοχλίας (no.2203, LG
1.3.168.24–5) app. **89**
s.v. Λύκος (no.814, LG 1.3.
295.28–31) **47**
s.v. μανθάνειν (no.155, LG
1.3.320.2–3) app. **1**
s.v. παράστασις (no.443, LG
1.4.41.29–42.6) **88** no.7; app. **98**
s.v. σίαλος (no.352, LG
1.4.353.11–12) app. **89**
s.v. σκαφηφόροι (no.544,
LG 1.4.373.21–6) **88** no.7; app. **101**
s.v. φθόνος (no.510, LG
1.4.743.6–8) app. **1**
- SYMEON LOGOTHETA (saec. 10 pCn)
in Chronico Cod. Reg. 1712
(*An. Par.* 1.14.25–34 Cramer) app. **59**
- SYNCELLUS → GEORGIUS SYNCELLUS
- SYNOPSIS CHRONICE
18.9–11 (BGMA 7.18.9–11
Sathas) app. **59**
- TERTULLIANUS (c. 160–c. 240 pCn)
Apologeticum
18.5 (CC 1.1.118.24–119.2
Dekkers) **62**
19.5–6 (CC 1.1.121.11–22) **66**
- THEMISTIUS (c. 317–388 pCn)
Orationes
21 252b (BT 2.31.4–7 Downey-
Norman) **11**
- THEODOSIUS MELITENUS (saec. 10 pCn)
Chronographia
42.14–26 Tafel app. **59**
- THEOPHYLACTUS (c. 1050–c. 1109)
Epistulae
34 ad Theophylactum Romanum
(PG 126.556D.45–7 de Rubeis) **159**
- IOANNES TZETZES (saec. 12 pCn)
Epistulae
61 (BT 91.24–92.4 Leone) **8** no.10;
69
- Historiae*
4.740; 747–8 (155 Leone) **34**
9.927–35 (383.3–11) app. **69**

<i>Prolegomena de comoedia Graeca</i>		<i>Vita Isocratis</i>	
Prooemium II (SA XIa II, 1.1A.32.2–11 Koster = CGF VI Mb 5–13 Kaibel)	58B	153–60 (CB 1.xxxvii Mathieu- Brémond)	155
<i>Prolegomena ad scholia in</i>		VITRUVIUS POLLIO, MARCUS (exeunte saec. 1 aCn)	
<i>Lycophronis Alexandram</i>		<i>De Architectura</i>	
2.4.3–9 Scheer	146	7, praef.16–17 (CB 9.3–10 Liou–Zuinghedau)	54
VICTORINUS, MARIUS (fl. 350 pCn)		IOANNES ZONARAS (saec. 12 pCn)	
<i>Ars Grammatica</i>		<i>Epitome Historiarum</i>	
1.4.95–6 (87.1–8 Mariotti)	147	4.16 (1.307.21–310.5 Dindorf)	app. 59
<i>Vita Aeschinis</i>			
3.6–7 (BT 6.112–7 Dilts)	140		

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

This index lists all passages other than the Demetrian texts listed in the Index of Texts, cited in the upper (or lower) apparatus (app.) an (selectively) in the notes to the translation (n.)

AELIANUS, CLAUDIUS (saec. 2–3 pCn)		ANECDOTA GRAECA Bekker → LEXICA SEGUERIANA	
<i>Varia Historia</i> (Dilts)		ANONYMUS ARGENTINENSIS (ante saec. 1 pCn)	
3.16	app. 43B; 43B n.1	24 (= 329 F 6 FGrH)	app. 52
12.17	app. 43B bis	ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA	
AESCHINES ATHENIENSIS (c. 390–c. 314aCn)		VII 113	app. 1
<i>Orationes</i>		ANTIPHANES (saec. 4 aCn)	
1.9–115	app. 127	F 288 PCG K.-A.	app. 135A
2.86	app. 134	ANTISTHENES RHODIUS (saec. 3–2 aCn)	
2.106	app. 134	508 F 15 FGrH	app. 107
2.157	app. 134	ANTONIUS MELISSA (saec. 11–12 pCn)	
3.152	app. 135A	<i>Loci communes</i> (Migne)	
3.218	app. 134	1.50 (PG 136.936A.10–11)	app. 76
AESOPICA		2.53 (PG 136.1133C.40–1)	app. 70A
T 74 Perry	app. 1 bis	APHTHONIUS RHETOR (saec. 4–5 pCn)	
ALEXANDER RHETOR (saec. 2 pCn)		<i>Prologomena in Aphthonii</i>	
<i>De Figuris</i>		<i>Progymnasmata</i>	
19 (RhGr 3.36 Spengel)	app. 135A	RhG 2.17.25–18.1	app. 79
AMPHICRATES ATHENIENSIS (saec. 1 aCn)		APION ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 1 pCn)	
F 2 FHG IV 300	app. 48	616 T 12 FGrH	app. 66
ANAXAGORAS CLAZOMENIUS (saec. 6–5 aCn)		APOLLODORUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 2 aCn)	
59 A 1 DK	app. 85; app. 94	244 F 31 FGrH	app. 94
ANECDOTA GRAECA Bachmann →		244 F 34 FGrH	app. 109
COLLECTIO VOCUM UTILIUM			

- APOLLONIUS RHODIUS (saec. 3 aCn)
 F 12 CA Powell app. 157
 APOSTOLIUS (saec. 15 pCn)
 12.53^b (CPG 2.555.6–7) app. 70A
 APPENDIX GNOMICA (Sternbach)
 45 app. 75
 46 app. 77
 47 app. 79
 APPENDIX VATICANA (Sternbach)
 I 47 app. 77
 ARCHEDICUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)
 F 4 PCG K.-A. app. 89
 ARISTARCHUS SAMOTHRACENUS (saec. 3–2 aCn)
 A. Ludwich, *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik*, 1884, 216–17 app. 143
 ARISTEAS (saec. 3 aCn/1 pCn)
Epistula ad Philocratem (Wendland)
 40 63 n.2
 201 64 n.2
 ARISTIDES, AELIUS (saec. 2 pCn)
Orationes (Lenz)
 6.22 p. 584.15–17 (30, vol. I p. 578 Dind.) app. 71
 ARISTIPPUS CYRENENSIS (c. 435–355 aCn)
 F 263 Mannebach = IV H 13 SSR II 125 Giannantoni app. 48
 F 265 = IV H 13 SSR II 125 Giannantoni app. 48
 ARISTOPHANES (c. 450–c. 385 aCn)
Nubes
 35 95 n.2
 ARISTOTELES (384–322 aCn)
 Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία
 8.1 app. 102
 8.4 app. 96A
 21.5 app. 95
 22.7 102 n.1
 43.4–5 app. 99
 59.3 app. 98
Rhetorica
 3.9 1409b17–32 app. 134
Fragmenta
 F 67f no.8 p. 402 Düring app. 78
 F 71,1 Gigon = F 3 Ross app. 104
 F 71,2 GIGON = F 3 ROSS app. 105
- ARISTOXENUS TARENTINUS (saec. 4 aCn)
 F 57 Wehrli app. 105
 F 58 app. 104
 ARRIANUS, FLAVIUS (saec. 1–2 pCn)
Anabasis
 4.14.3 app. 42
 7.19.2 25C n.1
Historia successorum Alexandri
 22 = 156 F 176a FGrH app. 13A
 ARSENIUS (saec. 15–16 pCn)
Violetum (Walz)
 93.7–9 app. 154
 122.11–12 app. 78
 147.16–17 app. 77
 208.4–5 app. 79
 265.26–8 app. 74
 436.17–18 app. 76
 ASCLEPIADES NICAEANUS,
 ALEXANDRINUS (3–2 aCn?)
 339 F 2 FGrH app. 95
 ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (2–3 pCn)
Deipnosophistae (Kaibel)
 13.67 594D–E 1 n.1
 AUCTOR AD HERENNIUM (saec. 1 aCn)
 4.15.21 app. 128
 4.18.25 app. 128
 4.40.52 app. 129
 BEROSUS BABYLONIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)
 680 T 3 FGrH app. 66
 BIAS PRIENAEUS (saec. 6 aCn)
 F 16 FPhG I 229 Mullach app. 77
 BION BORYSTHENITA (saec. 3 aCn)
 T 13 Kindstrand app. 123
 F 35A app. 79
 F 35B app. 79
 F 35C app. 79
 CAECILIUS CALACTINUS (saec. 2 pCn)
 F *20 Ofenloch app. 127
 F 126a app. 140
 F 149 app. 9B
 F 155 app. 96B
 CALLISTHENES OLYNTHIUS (saec. 4 aCn)
 124 T 8 FGrH app. 42
 124 T 19b FGrH app. 42
 124F 43 FGrH app. 105
 124 F 48 FGrH app. 104

CARMEN DE FIGURIS (saec. 4–5 pCn)		Vaticanus 742 f. 66 ^r	app. 77; app. 79
22–4 (RhLM 64 Halm)	app. 128	Vaticanus 743 f. 48 ^r	app. 70A
112–14 (RhLM 67)	app. 129	Vaticanus 1144 f. 217 ^r	app. 77
CARYSTIUS PERGAMENUS (saec. 2 aCn)		Vaticanus 1144 f. 228 ^r	app. 78
ap. Ath. 14.12 620B (= F 8 FHG IV 358)	app. 55B	COLLECTIO VOCUM UTILIUM (fort. saec. 8 pCn)	
F 10 FHG IV 358	app. 43A	s.v. εἰσαγγελία 1.210.4–8 An.	
CASTORIO(N) SOLEUS (saec. 4 aCn)		Bachm.	app. 96A
Diehl III ³ p. 67 = PMG 845 =		s.v. εἰσαγγελία 1.210.8–13 An.	
SH no.312	app. 43A	Bachm.	app. 96B
CEPHISODORUS (saec. 4 aCn)		COMICORUM ADESPOTA	
FHG II 85 et 112 FGrH	app. 133	F 149.3 PCG K.-A.	app. 135A
CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS (106–43 aCn)		CONON (saec. 1aCn–1 pCn)	
<i>De Legibus</i> (Ziegler-Görler)		26 F 4 FGrH	app. 65
2.23.59	app. 53 ter	CRANTOR SOLEUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
<i>De Oratore</i> (Kumaniecki)		F 4 Mette 1984, 18	app. 83
1.14.62	app. 132	CRATERUS MACEDO (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
1.61.260–1	app. 138	342 F 11a FGrH	app. 96B
<i>De Republica</i> (Bréguet)		CRATES THEBANUS (4–3 aCn)	
4.7	app. 110	V H 33 SSR II 536	
<i>Orator</i> (Westman)		Giannantoni	app. 33A; app. 33B
9.30–2	app. 123	V H 34 SSR II 536	app. 32
11.39	app. 123	DEMETRIUS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 3 aCn?)	
19.62	app. 123	643 T 2 FGrH	app. 66
23.76–26.90	app. 124	DEMETRIUS IXION (saec. 2 aCn)	
28.97–9	app. 124	F 7 = 48 Staesche	170
50.166–7	app. 128	F 14	172
CINCIUS ALIMENTUS, LUCIUS (saec. 2 aCn?)		F 15	171
F 1 GRF = F 1 HRR = F 1 Ann.		F 18	173
Rom. I 54–5	app. 147	F 25	175
CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 2–3 pCn)		DEMETRIUS JUDAEUS (saec. 3 aCn)	
<i>Paedagogus</i>		722 T 1 FGrH	app. 65
3.5.33.3	app. 72	722 F 1 FGrH	166
CODICES		722 F 2 FGrH	167
Baroccianus 39	app. 73	722 F 4 FGrH	168
Laurentianus 86.8	app. 75	722 F 6 FGrH	169
Laurentianus 86.8 f. 315 ^r	app. 77; app. 79	DEMETRIUS MAGNESIUS (saec. 1 aCn)	
Ottobonianus 192 f. 190 ^r	app. 78	F 5 Mejer	app. 164
Ottobonianus 192 f. 277 ^r	app. 77	F 6a	app. 163
Palatinus 122 f. 134 ^r no.15	app. 78	F 6b	app. 163
Palatinus 243 f. 248 ^v	app. 76	F 16	app. 1
Parisinus 1168	app. 76	F 17	app. 1
Parisinus 1168 f. 89 ^r	app. 78	F 27	app. 106
Parisinus 1168 f. 140 ^r –146 ^v	app. 76	F 29	108 n.1
Vaticanus 633 f. 115 ^v	app. 76		

DEMETRIUS SCEPSIUS (saec. 3–2 aCn)	18.18.5	app. 51
F 32 Gaede app. 157	18.48.1–4	25B n.2
DEMOCHARES ATHENIENSIS	18.54.2–3	15B n.1
(saec. 4–3 aCn)	18.55.1	16A n.4
75 T 2 FGrH app. 89	18.65.1–2	16A n.1
75 T 4 FGrH app. 120	18.66.4–67.3	15A n.1
75 F 4 FGrH app. 89	18.68.1; 68.2–3; 72.3–9	16A n.1
DEMOCRITUS ABDERITA (saec. 5–4 aCn)	18.74.1–3	20A n.1
68 A 1 DK app. 108	19.64.1	16A n.4
[DEMODOCUS]	19.77.6	22 n.1; 46 n.2 bis; 22 n.4
EpGF Davies 94–5 app. 144	20.4.1	16A n.4
DEMOSTHENES (384–322 aCn)	20.37.1–2	28 n.1
<i>Orationes</i>	20.37.3–6	23A n.2
18.136 37 n.1	20.45	27 n.1
21.77–126 app. 127	20.45.1	30 n.2
23.127 37 n.1	20.45.5–7	30 n.4
43.62 (lex apud) app. 53	20.46.1–3	27 n.3; 30 n.4
<i>Fragmenta</i> (Baiter & Sauppe)	20.112	46 n.2
F 7 app. 96A	32.5	app. 91
DICAEARCHUS MESSANIUS (saec. 4 aCn)	DIAGENES APOLLONIATES (saec. 5 aCn)	
no.86 Mirhady = F 67 Wehrli app. 57	T 1 Laks = 64 A 1 DK app. 107	
DICTA SEPTEM SAPIENTIUM	DIAGENES BABYLONIUS (saec. 2aCn)	
Recensio Monancensis	F 100 SVF III 237 von Armin	app. 132
nos.1, 2, 15–16 Cleob. app. Cleob. 87		
nos.1, 7, 13, 17 Sol. app. Sol. 87	F 103 SVF III 238 app. 131A	
no.19 Chil. app. Chil. 87	DIAGENES LAERTIUS (saec. 3 pCn)	
no.5 Thal. app. Thal. 87	<i>Vitae Philosophorum</i> (Long)	
Recensio Parisina	1.36 app. (Thal.) 87	
no.2 Cleob. app. Sol. 87	1.37 app. (Thal.) 87 ter	
no.23 Chil. app. Thal. 87	1.40 app. (Chil.) 87	
DIDYMUS CHALCENTERUS (saec. 1 aCn)	1.55 app. 117	
F 5 p. 374 Schmidt app. 1; app. 5	1.58 app. (Sol.) 87	
F 27.3 p. 323–4 app. 92	1.60 app. (Sol.) 87 ter	
DINARCHUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	1.63 app. (Sol.) 87	
<i>Fragmenta</i> (Conomis)	1.69 app. (Chil.) 87 bis	
T I.1 app. 9A	1.70 app. (Chil.) 87 ter	
T I.2 app. 9B	1.73 app. (Thal.) 87	
F XIV 1 app. 13A	1.77 app. (Pitt.) 87	
F XIV 2 app. 13A	1.78 app. (Pitt.) 87 bis	
F XIV 3 app. 13A	1.79 app. (Pitt.) 87	
F XVI 5 app. 101	1.85 app. (Per.) 87	
FXXXII 2 app. 100	1.87 app. (Sol.) 87;	
DIODORUS SICULUS (saec. 1 aCn)	app. (Biant.) 87 bis	
<i>Bibliotheca historica</i> (Fischer)	1.88 app. (Biant.) 87 bis	
5.37.1 app. 116B	1.92 app. (Cleob.) 87	
17.108.4–8 1 n.1	1.92–3 app. (Cleob.) 87	
18.17–18 12 n.1	1.93 app. (Cleob.) 87	

1.97	app. (Per.) 87	EUHEMERUS MESSENIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)
1.98	app. (Per.) 87	T 79A Winiarczyk = 63 F 11
1.99	app. (Per.) 87	FGrH app. 65
2.26	app. 105	EUPOLEMUS JUDAEUS (saec. 2 aCn)
2.102	48 n.2	723 T 3 FGrH app. 65
4.6	49 n.2	EUPOLIS (saec. 5 aCn)
5.17	app. 154	<i>Demi</i>
5.19	app. 74	F 102.6–7 PCG K.-A. app. 121
5.36	44 n.1	EURIPIDES (c. 484–406 aCn)
5.37	36 n.3	<i>Iphigenia Taurica</i>
5.75	18 n.1	1 app. 155
5.76	2 n.2; 6 n.1; app. 86	<i>Phoenissae</i>
5.78	42 n.2	558 app. 83 ; 83 n.1
5.83–5	1 n.1	<i>Fragmenta</i> (Nauck/Mette)
6.05	app. 79	F 228 N. ² = 282a M. 1967,
8.7	app. 141	77 app. 155
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS (saec. 1 aCn)		F 420.2–3 N. ² = 547e M. 1967,
<i>De Dinarcho</i> (Aujac)		136 app. 83
4	9A n.1	F 484. 1 N. ² = 667 M. 1967,
10.14	app. 141	170 app. 133
<i>De Isocrate</i> (Aujac)		F 819 N. ² = 1155f M. 1967,
13.3–4	app. 134	280 app. 155
13.5	app. 134	F 962.2–3 N. ² = 1380 M. 1968,
<i>Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum</i> (Aujac)		325 app. 32
1.4	app. 133	EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS (saec. 4 pCn)
2.6	Dicta no.32	<i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
6	app. 133	5.8.11 58A n.2
DURIS SAMIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)		EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS (saec. 12 pCn)
76 F 10 FGrH	app. 43A	<i>Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem</i> (van der Valk)
EPICURUS (342–270 aCn)		4.204 (2.733.11–13) app. 135C
F 8 Usener	app. 67	6.35 (2.237.7–13) app. 157
EPISTOLOGRAPHI GRAECI		10.418–22 (3.102.15) app. 153
218.1–27 Hercher	app. 59	EXCERPTA FLORENTINA (Meineke)
ERATOSTHENES CYRENENSIS (saec. 3–2 aCn)		2.13 no.47 app. 76
241 F 32 FGrH	app. 135A	EXCERPTA PARISINA (Sternbach)
ETYMOLOGICUM MAGNUM (saec. 12 pCn)		9 app. 70A
338.31–8	app. 52	255 app. 76
375.23–4	app. 100	FABIUS PICTOR (saec. 2–1 aCn)
EUBULUS (saec. 4 aCn)		F 1 GRF = F 1 HRR = F 1
F 54 PCG K.-A. = F 54a Hunter	app. 2	Ann. Rom. I 16–17 app. 147
EUCLIDES MEGARENSIS (5–4 aCn)		FAVORINUS ARELATENSIS (saec. 2 pCn)
F 13 Döring = II A 19 SSR I 383		F 6 Mensching app. 1
Giannantoni	app. 77	F 7 M. app. 1
		F 11 M. = F 41 Barigazzi app. 1

F 38 M.	app. 1	no.366	app. 154
F 54 M.	app. 1	GREGORIUS CORINTHIUS (saec. 12 pCn)	
F 37 Barigazzi	app. 1	in Hermogenis <i>Meth.</i>	
F 70 B.	app. 1	VIII 70 (RhG 7.2.1179.2–4	
FGRH		Walz)	app. 12
737 F 1 FGrH	app. 65	HARPOCRATION (saec. 2 pCn)	
794 F 5c FGrH	app. 66	<i>Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos</i>	
FLORILEGIUM LEIDENSE (Beynen)		(Keaney)	
52	app. 73	α 92 s.v. Ἀμμωνίς	app. 13A
FLORILEGIUM MONACENSE (Meineke)		α 274 s.v. Ἀφαρεύς	app. 155
52	app. 73	δ 27 s.v. δήμαρχος	app. 95
239	app. 154	δ 52 s.v. διαιτηταί	app. 97
FLORILEGIUM OTTOBONIANUM		ε 7 s.v. εἰσαγγελία	app. 96A bis
39	app. 76	κ 100 s.v. κυρία ἐκκλησία	app. 99
107	app. 73	ν 4 s.v. ναυκραρικά	app. 95
221	app. 70A	ν 19 s.v. νομοφύλακες	app. 13A;
FLORILEGIUM PALATINUM (Wachsmuth)			app. 52
83	app. 73	ο 47 s.v. ὅτι χιλίας ἐζημιοῦντο	
FLORILEGIUM PALATINUM-VATICANUM			app. 153
69	app. 77	HECATAEUS ABDERITA (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
166	app. 76	264 F 23 FGrH; cf. 73 B 15	
196	app. 70A	DK	app. 59
253	app. 73	HERACLIDES LEMBUS (saec. 2 aCn)	
GELLIUS, GNAEUS (saec. 2 aCn)		F 10 FHG III 170	app. 1
F 2 GRF = F 3 HRR	app. 147	HERACLIDES PONTICUS (saec. 1 pCn)	
GNOMICA BASILEENSIA (fort. saec. 11		F 143 Wehrli	app. 57
pCn)		HERACLITUS EPHESIUS (saec. 6–5 aCn)	
17 Kindstrand	app. 78	22 A 1 DK	app. 106
74	app. 77	HERMIPPUS SMYRNAEUS (saec. 3 aCn)	
GNOMOLOGIUM BAROCCIANUM		F 58 Wehrli	app. 1
38	app. 76	F 70	app. 163
106	app. 73	F 76	app. 164
220	app. 70A	F 79	app. 140
GNOMOLOGIUM BYZANTINUM		F 92	app. 145
(Wachsmuth)		HERMOGENES TARSENSIS (saec. 2–3 pCn)	
53	app. 76 bis	851 FGrH	app. 65
105	app. 73	HERODIANUS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 2	
255	app. 70A	pCn)	
GNOMOLOGIUM COD. PAL. 122		<i>De prosodia</i>	
f. 159 ^r no.68	app. 77	3.1.123.1–4 Lentz	app. 135C
GNOMOLOGIUM PARISINUM		HESIODUS ASCRAEUS (saec. 8/7 aCn)	
24	app. 76	F 214 Merkelbach-West	app. 157
GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM 743 (saec.		HESYCHIUS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 5 pCn)	
14 pCn)		δ 824 s.v. δήμαρχοι Latte	app. 95
no.48 Sternbach	app. 1	δ 1032 s.v. διαιτηταί	app. 97
no.58	app. 78	θ 77 s.v. εἰσαγγελία	app. 52
no.265	app. 79	κ 4671 s.v. κυρία ἐκκλησία	app. 99

π 2475 s.v. πλάτανος Schmidt		XIX, H 78	23B n.1
	app. 153	ASA 39–40 [N.S. 23–4] (1961–62)	
χ 217 s.v. Χαρώνειον	app. 52	no.103	app. 151
HIERONYMUS RHODIUS (saec. 3 aCn)		no.207	app. 151
F 43 Wehrli	app. 104	<i>Curse Tablets</i>	
F 44	app. 105	no.57	app. 46
F 52a	app. 134	Dittenberger <i>Syll.</i> ³	
HIERONYMUS AEGYPTIUS (ante saec. 1 pCn)		318 (= IG II ² 1201)	app. 16B
787 T 1b FGrH	app. 66	319 (= IG II ² 2971)	app. 162
HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS (c. 350–420 pCn)		GRBS 26 (1985)	
<i>Interpretatio Chronicorum Eusebii</i> (Helm)		no.14	app. 46
ad Ol. 114,4	app. 14	<i>Hesperia</i>	
ad Ol. 116	app. 14	10 (1941) no.18 (= <i>Agora</i> XIX, H 78)	app. 23B
HIPPIAS ELEUS (saec. 5 aCn)		47 (1978) no.8 (= SEG 28.63)	app. 162
86 B 11 DK	app. 113	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>	
HOMERUS (saec. 8 aCn)		II 584	app. 16B
<i>Ilias</i>		II ² 410,18	app. 13A
2.405–7	143 n.3	II ² 469,3	app. 22
2.408; 409	app. 143	II ² 834,22	app. 16B
16.698–9	app. 160	II ² 1202,6	app. 16B; 16B n.2
16.698–701	160 n.1	II ² 1214,1–4	app. 16B
<i>Odyssea</i>		II ² 1285,1–12	app. 162
23.296	app. 145	II ² 2971	16B n.2; 151 n.1
<i>Homeri Vita Herodotea</i>		II ² 3027	app. 102
35	app. 116A	<i>Marmor Parium</i> (264/3 aCn) (Jacoby)	
HYPERIDES (c. 390–322 aCn)		B 15–16, Ep. 13	app. 23A
<i>Orationes</i>		B 22–4, Ep. 19	app. 20A
3.4	app. 96A	B 24–5, Ep. 20	app. 20A; app. 23A
3.7–8 (lex ap.)	app. 96A	B 25–6, Ep. 21	app. 27
3.12	app. 96A	NSERC 1925 no.11 Mauri	app. 80
<i>Fragmenta</i> (Jensen)		SOEM	
F 94	app. 100	no.8	app. 48
IBN USAIBIA (ob. 1270 pCn)		<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>	
‘Uyun al-anba fi tabaqat al-atibba’		3.123	app. 162
20–1 (p. 216 Düring)	app. 13A	25.89,30–1	app. 16B
IDOMENEUS LAMPSACENUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)		25.112,15–16	app. 16B
338 F 4 FGrH	app. 102	28.101	app. 16B
338 F 13 FGrH	app. 140	29.130	app. 16B
INSCRIPTIONES		41.133	app. 23B
<i>The Athenian Agora</i>		IRENÆUS LUGDUNENSIS (saec. 2 pCn)	
III 149	52 n.1	<i>Adversus Haereses</i>	
III no.302	app. 102	3.21.2	58A n.2
III no.718	app. 50	ISAEUS (c. 413–c. 343 aCn)	
		<i>Orationes</i>	
		3.47	app. 98

- ISIDORUS HISPALENSIS (saec. 7 pCn)
Etymologiae sive Origines
 6.3.5 app. 62
- IULIUS VICTOR, GAIUS (saec. 4 pCn)
Ars Rhetorica (Celentano)
 22,438, p. 92.27–8 app. 124
 22,438, p. 92.28–93.1 app. 124
 22,438, p. 93.1–3 app. 124
- JOHANNES MALALAS (c. 480–c. 570 pCn)
Chronographia
 V 83^a Dindorf 61 n.1
- JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS (saec. 1 pCn)
Antiquitates Judaicae (Niese)
 12.101 64 n.2
 12.111–12 app. 59
- LEXICA SEGUERIANA
 4 *Dikôn Onomata*
 s.v. νομοφύλακες 1.191.21–2
 AB app. 52
- 5 *Lexeis Rhetorikai*
 s.v. διαιτηταί τίνες εισί 1.235.20–5
 AB app. 97
 s.v. δήμαρχοι 1.242.16–18
 AB app. 95
 s.v. εισαγγελία 1.244.14–17
 AB app. 96A
 s.v. εισαγγελία 1.244.18–23
 AB app. 96B
 s.v. ένδεκα τίνες εισί 1.250.4–9
 AB app. 52
 s.v. κυρία έκκλησία 1.274.19–20
 AB app. 99
 s.v. μή ούσα δίκη 1.278.29–33
 AB app. 97
 s.v. παρακατάστασις 1.290.19–22
 AB app. 98
 s.v. σκαφηφορέιν 1.304.27–9
 AB app. 101
- LEXICON RHETORICUM CANTABRIGIENSE
 (saec. 14 pCn)
 s.v. νομοφύλακες (22.1–10
 Houtsma) app. 52
- LEXICON SABBAITICUM (saec. 14 pCn)
 48.4–8 s.v. δήμαρχος Papadopulos
 app. 95
 48.25–49.3 s.v. διαιτηταί app. 97
 54.12–16 s.v. εισαγγελία app. 96B
- 54.17–55.2 s.v. εισαγγελία app. 96A
 54.21–42 s.v. εισαγγελία app. 96A
 58.22–7 s.v. ένδεκα app. 52
- LEXICON VINDOBONENSE (Nauck)
 no.8 s.v. διαιτηταί app. 97
 no.257 s.v. ένδεκα app. 52
- LIVIUS, TITUS (59 aCn–17 pCn)
Ab urbe condita
 5.9 82A n.2
- LUCIANUS SAMOSATENUS (saec. 2 pCn)
Anacharsis
 17 app. 16B
- [LUCIANUS]
Demosthenis Encomium
 31 app. 13A
- LYCOPHRON (saec. 4–3 aCn)
 T 4 TrGF I 274 app. 47
- LYCUS RHEGINUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)
 570 T 1 FGrH app. 47
- MACROBIUS (saec. 5 pCn)
Saturnalia
 6.4.8 app. 121
- MANETHO AEGYPTIUS (saec. 3 aCn)
 609 T 6b FGrH app. 66
- MAXIMUS CONFESSOR (c. 580–662 pCn)
Loci communes (Combefis)
 2 (PG 91.733.37–8) app. 77
 17 (PG 91.824.36–7) app. 76
 17 (PG 91.825.44–5) app. 76
 18 (PG 91.833C.31–2) app. 73
 19 (PG 91.840.20–1) app. 70A
 20 (PG 91.848.3–4) app. 78
 35 (PG 91. 900.29–31) app. 154
 63 (PG 91.993.54–996.2) app. 74
- MELISSA AUGUSTANA
 34.5 cod. Par. Gr. 1168 app. 70A
 38.18 app. 76
- MENANDER EPHESIUS (saec. 2 aCn)
 783 T 2a FGrH app. 66
- MENANDER (saec. 4–3 aCn)
Fragmenta (Körte)
 T 9 app. 44
 F 8 app. 1
 F 238 app. 153
 F 278 app. 98
- MNASEAS PATRENSIS (saec. 3 aCn)
 F 34 FHG III 155 app. 65

NICANDER COLOPHONIUS (saec. 2aCn)		<i>PHerc.</i> 1007, col. 11a (BT 1.192)	
<i>Theriaca</i>			app. 132
612	158 n.1	<i>PHerc.</i> 1007, col. 15a3–6	
613–14	app. 158	(BT 1.196)	app. 135B
NILUS ANCYRANUS (ob. c. 430 pCn)		PHILOSTEPHANUS CYRENENSIS (saec. 3	
<i>De malignis cogitationibus</i> (Migne)		aCn)	
PG 79.1453C,41–2	app. 70A	FHG III 33	app. 113
NONIUS MARCELLUS (saec. 4 pCn)		PHILOSTRATUS, FLAVIUS (saec. 2–3	
<i>De Conpendiosa Doctrina</i> (Lindsay)		pCn)	
p. 24,15	app. 110	<i>Vitae Sophistarum</i>	
ONESICRITUS ASTYPALEIUS (saec. 4–3		1.481	app. 126
aCn)		PHOTIUS (saec. 9 pCn)	
134 F 38 FGrH	app. 55B	<i>Bibliotheca</i> (Henry)	
PANAETIUS RHODIUS (saec. 2 aCn)		167 114a14–115b17	Dicta
F 45 van Straaten = T 86		265 494a23–b2	app. 13A
Alesse	app. 84	<i>Lexicon</i>	
F 48 v. Str. = T 103 A.	app. 57	s.v. δήμαρχος δ 244 Theodoridis	
F 122 v. Str. = T. 17 A.	app. 110		app. 95
F 131 v. Str. = T 153 A.	app. 102	s.v. Ἐρκειος Ζεύς (1.14.18–20	
F 132 v. Str. = T 142 A.	app. 104	Porson)	app. 100
F 133 v. Str. = T 143 A.	app. 105	s.v. περὶ τῶν ἑνδεκα (1.43–4)	app. 52
PAPYRI		s.v. κυρία ἐκκλησία	
<i>PHerc.</i> → PHILODEMUS		(1.165.1–4)	app. 99
PARTHENIUS MYTHOGRAPHUS (saec. 1		s.v. μὴ οὐσα δίκη (1.229.24–	
aCn)		230.2)	app. 97
21.2	app. 157	s.v. ναυκραρία (1.247.22–	
PAUSANIAS (saec. 2 pCn)		248.9)	app. 95
<i>Graeciae descriptio</i> (Rocha-Pereira)		s.v. οἱ νομοφύλακες (1.276)	app. 52
1.8.5	25C n.1	PLATO (c. 429–347 aCn)	
1.15.1	46 n.2	<i>Apologia</i>	
1.15.3	app. 24A	17D2–3	app. 109
1.25.7–8	17 n.3	23B9–C1	app. 102
PHILO JUDAEUS SENIOR (saec. 2 aCn)		<i>Epistulae</i>	
729 T 1 FGrH	app. 65	7	app. 42
PHILOCHORUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 4–3		<i>Gorgias</i>	
aCn)		483A8–B2	app. 75
328 F 64a FGrH	app. 52	<i>Leges</i>	
328 F 64bα FGrH	app. 52	12 958E6–7	app. 53
328 F 64bβ FGrH	app. 52	12 958E8–959A1	app. 53
328 F 65 FGrH	app. 153	<i>Phaedo</i>	
328 F 127 FGrH	app. 111	58A10–B4	app. 114
328 F 137 FGrH	app. 92	<i>Protagoras</i>	
328 F 142 FGrH	app. 112	343A1–2	app. 93
328 F 199 FGrH	app. 96B	<i>Respublica</i>	
PHILODEMUS (ineunte saec. 1 aCn)		337A	11 n.1
<i>De Rhetorica</i> (Sudhaus)		337A3–7	app. 11

300 Demetrius of Phalerum

PLINIUS SECUNDUS, GAIUS (23/24–79 pCn)		<i>De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute</i>	
		4 327F	app. 55B
<i>Naturalis Historia</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
7.29(30).107	app. 55B	F 14.2 Bernardakis = F 115	
PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (saec. 1–2 pCn)		Sandbach	app. 158
<i>Alexander</i> (Ziegler)		[PLUTARCHUS]	
8.2	app. 55B	<i>Consolatio ad Apollonium</i> (Gärtner)	
26.1–3	app. 55B	1 102B	app. 32
<i>Cimon</i> (Ziegler)		<i>Vitae decem oratorum</i> (Mau)	
13.5–7	app. 50	837E; 838B	app. 155
<i>Demetrius</i> (Ziegler)		844D–F	app. 137
9.4–10.1	29 n.5	844E	app. 135C
10.2	30 n.4	845A–B	app. 135B
<i>Demosthenes</i> (Ziegler)		845B–C	app. 135C
6.4	app. 138	845D	app. 135A
6.5	app. 135B	846A–C	app. 13A
7.1–5	app. 135B	846F	app. 164
10.2–3	app. 156	852B	app. 16B
28.3	13A n.1; 13B n.1	POLLUX, JULIUS (saec. 2 pCn)	
31.4–6	25B n.2	<i>Onomasticon</i> (Bethe)	
<i>Dio</i> (Ziegler)		8.61	app. 97
4–5; 10–16; 19–20	app. 42	8.95	app. 99
<i>Lycurgus</i> (Ziegler)		8.100	app. 97
1.2	113 n.2	8.108–11	app. 95
22	113 n.1	8.112	app. 153
<i>Pericles</i> (Ziegler)		POLYBIUS MEGALOPOLITANUS (c. 200–118 aCn)	
12	app. 50; app. 110	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Philopoemen</i> (Ziegler)		99	app. 91
7	90 n.1	POSIDONIUS APAMENSIS (saec. 2–1 aCn)	
<i>Phocion</i> (Ziegler)		F 239 Edelstein-Kidd (= 87 F 47	
4.1	app. 4	FGrH)	app. 116A
4.2	67 n.1	F 240a (= 87 F 48 (b)	
26–7	12 n.1	FGrH)	app. 116B
27.5	13A n.1	F 240b	app. 116B
28.7	app. 51	PTOLEMAEUS MENDESIUS (ante saec. 1 pCn)	
30	25B n.2	611 T 2a FGrH	app. 66
34.9	15A n.1	QUINTILIANUS (30/40–c. 100 pCn)	
<i>Solon</i> (Ziegler)		<i>Institutio Oratoria</i> (Winterbottom)	
21.5–7	app. 53	1.11.5	app. 138
21.6	app. 53 bis	2.4.33	126 n.1
21.7	app. 53; app. 153	9.2.101	app. 128
<i>Themistocles</i> (Ziegler)		9.3.81–6	app. 128
23.1	app. 96B	9.3.84	app. 128
<i>Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata</i>		9.3.92	app. 128
17 185F	app. 35		

9.3.94–5	app. 129	SOTION ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 3–2 aCn)	
10.1.76–9	125 n.1	ap. Stob. 4 48b.30	app. 32
SATYRUS CALLATIANUS (saec. 3/2 aCn)		F 18 Wehrli	app. 1
F 15 FHG III 163	app. 105	STOBAEUS, JOANNES (saec. 5 pCn)	
SCHOLIA		<i>Anthologium</i> (Hense)	
scholia in Aeschinem 3.13	app. 52	3.10.37	app. 79
scholia in Aristophanis		3.40.3.4	app. 35
<i>Aves</i> 194c	app. 135A	3.41.8	app. 145
<i>Vespas</i> 1108	app. 52	3.8.20	154 n.1
scholia in Homeri <i>Iliadem</i>		4.41.1	app. 83
2.405–9; 408; 409 (bT)	app. 143	STRABO (saec. 1 aCn–1 pCn)	
6.35a	app. 157	<i>Geographica</i>	
10.419–20c (bT)	app. 153	13.1.27	app. 55B
scholia in Homeri <i>Odyseam</i>		17.1.17	app. 86
23.296 (HMQ)	app. 145	SUDA (exeunte saec. 10 p.Cn)	
scholia in Nicandri <i>Theriaca</i> 377–8a;		α 2703 s.v. Ἀντίπατρος Adler	
585a	app. 158		app. 13A
scholia in Platonis <i>Rempubicam</i>		β 411 s.v. βοτρυοσταγή	app. 89
565C	app. 96B	δ 420 s.v. δήμαρχος	app. 95
scholia in Thucydidem 5.47.9	app. 52	δ 421 s.v. δήμαρχοι	app. 95
SELEUCUS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 1 pCn)		δ 472 s.v. Δημοχάρης	app. 89
F 9 Müller	app. 143	δ 887 s.v. διαιτηταί	app. 97
SEXTUS EMPIRICUS (saec. 2–3 pCn)		δ 888 s.v. διαιτηταῖς	app. 97
<i>adversus Mathematicos</i>		ε 3015 s.v. Ἐρκεῖος Ζεύς	app. 100
11.55	app. 83	ει 220 s.v. εἰσαγγελία	app. 96A
SOCRATES (?469–399 aCn)		ει 221 s.v. εἰσαγγελία	app. 96B
I B 7a SSR I 22 Giannantoni	app. 105	ει 222 s.v. εἰσαγγελία	app. 96A bis
I B 48 = 52 SSR I 37	app. 105	η 617 s.v. ἡταίρηκεν	app. 89
I B 49 SSR I 36	app. 104	θ 266 s.v. θεσμοθέτης	app. 52
I B 53 SSR I 37–8	app. 102	κ 2760 s.v. κυρία ἐκκλησίας	app. 99
I B 54 SSR I 38	app. 104	μ 12 s.v. μὰ γῆν	app. 135A
I C 366 SSR I 133	app. 76	μ 1003 s.v. μητραγύρτης	app. 52
I C 396 SSR I 137	app. 154	ν 487 s.v. νομοφύλακες	app. 52
I D 1 SSR I 221	app. 109	ν 488 s.v. νομοφυλακίου θύρα	app. 52
SOLON (saec. 6–5 aCn)		οι 124 s.v. οἱ νομοφύλακες	
T 8 Ruschenbusch	app. 117	τίνες	app. 52
F 72a R. = T 469 Martina	app. 53	χ 140 s.v. Χαρώνειος θύρα	app. 52
F 72b R. = T 468 M.	app. 53	TELES MEGARENSIS (saec. 3 aCn)	
F 72c R. = T 470 M.	app. 53	22.14–23.1 Hense	app. 35
F 77 R. = T 485 M.	app. 117	THALES MILESIUS (saec. 6 aCn)	
F 79–80 R.	app. 95	11 A 1 DK	app. 93
F 92 R.	app. 117	THALLUS SAMARITANUS (saec. 1/2 pCn)	
F 143a R. = T 484a M.	app. 117	256 T 3 FG rH	app. 66
T 340 Martina	app. 95	THEODECTES (saec. 4 aCn)	
T 466 M.	app. 53	T 17 TrGF	app. 59
T 486 M.	app. 117	THEODORUS CYRENENSIS (saec. 5 aCn)	
		T 3A Winiarczyk	app. 48

- T 3B app. 48
 IV H 13 SSR II 125
 Giannantoni app. 48
 THEODOTUS JUDAEUS (ante saec. 1 aCn)
 732 T 1 FGrH app. 65
 THEON, AELIUS (saec. 1–2 pCn)
Progymnasmata (Patillon)
 5 app. 79 bis
 THEON ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 1 aCn– 1 pCn)
 F 3 Guhl app. 158
 THEOPHILUS (ante saec. 2 aCn?)
 733 T 1 FGrH app. 65
 THEOPHRASTUS ERESIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)
Fragmenta (FHS&G)
 app. no.5B app. 14
 no.1 36 n.3
 no.1.38–40 app. 10
 no.18.3 app. 123
 no.18.5 app. 1; app. 2; 8;
 app. 10; app. 19;
 app. 36; app. 119;
 app. 121; app. 131B
 no.18.7 app. 9A; app. 9B
 no.18.12 44 n.1
 no.23 33B n.1
 no.26 app. 67
 no.29 app. 11
 no.52B app. 119
 no.436.4c 69 n.1
 no.445 app. 154
 no.589.17c app. 96A
 no.591 app. 57
 no.636A app. 96A
 no.636B app. 96B
 no.653 app. 101
 no.706 app. 156
 THEOPOMPUS CHIUS (saec. 4 aCn)
 115 T 11 FGrH app. 59
- 115 F 20a FGrH app. 133
 THRASYLLUS MENDESIUS (saec. 1 pCn?)
 T 18a Tarrant = F 5 FHG III
 504 108 n.1
 THUCYDIDES (c. 455/460–c. 399 aCn)
Historiae
 1.138.5 35 n.3
 TIMAEUS TAUROMENIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)
 566 F 11b FGrH 51 n.2
 566 F 35b FGrH app. 89
 TIMOCLES (saec. 4 aCn)
 F 34 PCG K.-A. app. 153
 F 41 PCG K.-A. app. 135A
 TIMOLAUS MACEDO (saec. 4 aCn)
 F 850 SH Lloyd-Jones &
 Parsons app. 144
 VALERIUS MAXIMUS (fl. c. 31 pCn)
 2.10 ext. 1 25C n.1
 8.7 ext. 1 app. 138
 8.12 ext. 2 app. 132
 XENOCRATES CHALCEDONIUS (saec. 4 aCn)
 F 2 Isnardi app. 49
 F 37 app. 131A
 F 38 app. 131C
 F 39 app. 131B
 XENOCRATES COLOPHONIUS (saec. 6–5 aCn)
 21 A 1 DK app. 84
 XENOPHON (c. 430–c. 354 aCn)
Memorabilia
 3.1.7 app. 90
 ZENOBIUS (saec. 2 pCn)
 6.41 (CPG 1.173.8–9) app. 52
 ZOILUX AMPHIPOLITANUS (saec. 4 aCn)
 FHG II 85; 71 FGrH app. 133
 ZOPYROS BYZANTIUS (post Philochorum)
 F 6 FHG IV 533 app. 92

INDEX OF NAMES

The numbers refer to the translations of the fragments and to the notes (n.) to the translations. In the case of **1** and **59** the paragraph numbers are added in parentheses.

- Abraham **39** n. 1
 Academy, the **36** n. 1; **131C**
 Acamantis, tribe **152** n. 1
 Achaean(s) **90** n. 1; **157**
 Achilles **157**
 Acropolis, the **28**; **101**
 Aeacus **13B**
 Aegina **13A–B**
 Aeschines **120** n. 1; **121** n. 1; **122**;
125 n. 1; **127**; **134**; **135A**; **140**
 —*Against Timarchus* **127**
 Agamemnon **143–4**
 Agatharchides of Cnidus **65** n. 1
 Agora, the **50**
 Agryle, deme **96B**
 Aiantes, the **143** n. 3
 Aixone, deme **16B**
 Alcibiades **24B** n. 1
 Alcmaeon **96B**
 Alexander the Great **1** (75); **9B**; **11** n.
1; **23A** n. 2; **41–2**; **55B**; **60**; **68**; **82A**
 Alexander, son of Numenius **127**
 Alexander, son of Polyperchon **15A** n.
1; **16A** n. 1
 Alexandria **1** (76); **35–6**; **58A–B**; **59**
 n. 5
 Alopece, deme **102**
 Alpien mountains **116B**
 Amphiaraus **158**
 Amphicrates of Athens **48**
 —*On Famous Men* **48**
 Amphitryon **144**
 Anaxagoras **84–5**; **94**; **107**
 Anaxicrates, archon **23E**; **30**; **31**
 Anaximander **40** n. 1
 Anaximenes **107**; **164**
 Andreas **63**; **64** n. 3
 Andronicus, actor **135B**
 Antignotus **152**
 Antigonus Gonatas **7**; **162** n. 3
 Antigonus Monophthalmus **1** (78);
16A n. 1; **21–2**; **23A** n. 2; **26**; **29** n.
1; **30**; **39** n. 1
antilêxis **97**
 Antiochis, tribe **102**
 Antiochus III, 'the Great' **25C** n. 1
 Antipater **12** n. 1; **13A–B**; **15A** n. 1;
17; **25B** n. 2; **43A**; **89**; **131A–C**
 Antisthenes of Rhodes **107**
antitheton **128**
 Antonius, Marcus **120** n. 2
 Aphareus, son of Hippias **155**
 Aphepsion, archon **109**
 Apion **66**
 Apollo **160** n. 1
 —Coropian **158**
 —Delian, Games of **162**
 —of the (Fore) Fathers **100**
 Apollodorus of Athens **94**; **109**
 —*Chronicles* **94**; **109**
 Apollothemis **107**
 Appius Claudius *see* Claudius Caecus,
 Appius
 Arab(ia) **148**
 Aramaic **59** n. 2
 Archedicus of Athens **89**
 Archestratus of Athens **102**
 Archias **3A** n. 1; **13B**; **164**
 Archilochus of Paros **55B**
 Archytas of Tarentum **40** n. 1
 Areopagus, the Court of the **7**; **48**; **153**
 Arethas **70B** n. 1
 Arginusae, battle of **112**
 Aristagora **7**
 Aristarchus of Samothrace **143**
 Aristetas **59** n. 5; **63**; **64** n. 3
 Aristides I 'the Just', son of Lysimachus
24B n. 1; **102–4**; **105** n. 2; **156**
 Aristides II, grandson of Aristides
 I **105**

- Aristobulus of Alexandria 60
 Aristocles 55A
 —*On Choruses* 55A
 Aristocrates, son of Aristophanes 16B;
 n. 2; 112
 Aristodemus of Miletus 29
 Aristogiton 24B n. 1; 25C
 Aristonicus of Marathon 13A–B
 Aristophanes 111
 —*Clouds* 95 n. 2
 —*Wasps* 111 n. 2
 Aristophanes of Byzantium? 65
 Aristotle 9B; 10; 40 n. 1; 57; 65 n. 1;
 95; 98; 104–5; 133
 —*The Athenian Constitution* 98
 —*On Being Well-Born* 104–5
 Aristotle, the commander 21
 Aristoxenus of Tarentum 104–5
 Arrhidaeus *see* Philip Arrhidaeus
 Arrianus, Flavius 13A
 Arsinoe 59 n. 1
 Artaxerxes III 60 n. 1
 Artemis 109
 Artemon of Miletus 86
 Asclepiades of Alexandria 95
 Asclepiades, son of Areius 3
 Asclepius 135B–C
 Asia 9B
 Athena of Forethought 144
 Athen(ian)s 1 (75); (76); (79); (82); 2;
 7 n. 2; 9A–B; 12 n. 1; 13A; 15B;
 16A–B; 17–19; 20B; 23A; 23D–E;
 24A; 25A; 25C; 26–30; 35; 36 n. 1;
 39; 49; 53–4; 56; 58A; 62 n. 1; 87;
 89; 92–4; 99; 101–3; 105 n. 1; 106–
 9; 114; 117; 121–2; 151; 155; 162
 Athenocles of Cyzicus 143
 Attica 2; 17; 22; 51; 116A
 Atticus *see* Pomponius Atticus, Titus
 Automedes of Corcyra 146
 Automedes of Mycenae 144

barbitos 146
 Berenice 1 (78)
 Berosus, the Chaldaean 66
 Bias, son of Teutamides 40 n. 1; 87

 Boeotia 22; 144
 Botrys 89
 Bouthas 47
 Busiris 1 (78); 2

 Cadmea 22
 Cadmus 147
 Caecilius of Caleacte 96B; 140
 Caerimus, archon 23B n. 1; 23E; 26
 Calchedon 49 n. 1
 Calliades, archon 94 n. 4
 Callias, archon 94
 Callimachus of Cyrene 58B n. 3
 Callimedon 15A
 Callisthenes of Olynthus 41–2; 104–5
 Calvus *see* Licinius Calvus
 Caria 21
 Carthage 23A; 91 n. 1
 Carystius of Pergamon 43A; 55A n. 1
 —*Records* 43A
 Carystus 22
 Cassander 1 (78); 15A n. 1; 15B;
 16A; 17; 19; 21–2; 23E; 25B n. 2;
 27 n. 1; 28; n. 1; 29–30; 39 n. 1;
 43A; 46; 55A n. 1; 55B; 89
 Cato *see* Porcius Cato
 Cecropis, tribe 16B n. 1
 Cecrops 24B n. 1; 53; 105 n. 1
 Cellerus 69
 Cephisodorus of Athens or Thebes 133
 Ceramicus 53
 Ceres 54
 Chabrias 24B n. 1
 Chaerephon, the parasite 153
 Chaerondas, archon 155
 Chaeronea, battle of 17 n. 3; 56 n. 2;
 155
 Chalcedonians 20A
 Chalcis 46 n. 2; 163
 Chaldaean(s) 65–6
 Charicles 15A
 Charisius 128 n. 1
 Charon, door of 52
 Charondas of Catana 40 n. 1
 Chilon, son of Demagetes 40 n. 1; 87
 Choerilus of Samos 65 n. 1

- Cicero *see* Tullius Cicero
Cimon 24B n. 1; 50; 92; 156
Cincius Alimentus, Lucius 147
Cithaeron 144
Claudius Caecus, Appius 30
Cleisthenes 56; 95
Cleobulus, son of Euagoras 40 n. 1; 87
Cleon 1 (76); 2 n. 2
Cleon, son of Cleaenetus 111
Cleonae 13B
Cleopatra 23A
Cleophon 4 n. 1
Clitus 20A
Clytemnestra 144
Codrus 24B n. 1
Conon of Athens 1 (76); 4; 24B n. 1
Conon Historicus 65
Corcyra 146
Corinth(ian) 7; 9A–B; 28; 34; 87
Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus,
 Publius 56 n. 1
Corope 158
Cos 23A
Crannon, battle of 12 n. 1; 18
Craterus of Macedonia 12; 96B
Crates of Thebes 32; 33A–B
Creon 144
Cretans 56
Crito 102
Ctesicles of Athens 51
—*Chronicles* 51
Cynulcus 3 n. 1
Cyprians 43A

Damasias, archon 93
Delians 109
Delphi 144
Demades 4 n. 1; 12 n. 1; 13A; 25B;
 121 n. 1
demarchoi 95
Demeter 48 n. 1; 162
Demetrius of Alexandria 65 n. 2
—*On Egypt* 65 n. 2
Demetrius of Byzantium 1 n. 4
Demetrius Chlorus 158 n. 2
Demetrius the Cynic 154 n. 1
Demetrius Judaeus 65 n. 2
—*On the Kings in Judaea* 65 n. 2
Demetrius of Magnesia 1 (75); 18 n. 1;
 108 n. 1; 155 n. 3; 156 n. 1; 163;
 164 n. 1
—*Namesakes* 1 (75)
—*On poets of the same name* 163
Demetrius of Phalerum
—(*Apology*) of Socrates 102; 104;
 106–8
—(*List of*) Archons 92–4
—*On Fortune* 82A–B
—(*On the*) Legislation (of the Athe-
 nians) 98–101
—*On Old Age* 84–5
—(*On*) Rhetoric 132; 141; 148
—*Sayings of the Seven Wise Men* 87
—Demetrius, grandson of 7; 16B n. 2;
 151 n. 1; 162
Demetrius Poliorcetes 1 (77); 2 n. 4; 7
 n. 2; 17; n. 3; 26–31; 35 n. 2; 43B
Demetrius, the rhetor 151
Demetrius of Scepsis 157 n. 1
Demochares of Athens 89; 120
Democritus of Abdera 108
Demodocus of Corcyra 146
—of Laconia 144
Demogenes 20A
Demophon 24B n. 1
Demosthenes 13A; 96A; 120; 121 n.
 1; 122; 125 n. 1; 127; 129 n. 1; 134;
 135A–C; 136–9; 156; 163
—*Against Medon* 96A
—*Against Midias* 127
Dicaearchus 57
Didymus Chalcenterus 1 (76); 92
—*Table-talk* 1 (76)
Dinarchus 9A–B; 23E; 100–1; 120 n.
 1; 121 n. 1; 128 n. 1
—*Against Agasicles* 101
—*Against Moschion* 100
Dio the Stoic 57
Diogenes of Apollonia 107
Diogenianus of Heraclea 6
Diognis 43A
Diomedes 143 n. 3

- Diomedon 112
 Dion 24B n. 1
 Dionysius, commander of
 Munychia 21; 27; 30
 Dionysius II, tyrant of Sicily 42; 43B
 n. 2
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus
 —*On the Style of Demosthenes* 133 n. 1
 Dionysus 102
 Diospolis 1 (78); 2
 Diphilus 33A n. 1
 —*Parasite* 33A n. 1
 Diyllus of Athens 5
 Draco 20B n. 1; 56
 Duris 43A; 43B n. 1
 —*Histories* 43A

 Ecbatana 156
 Egypt(ians) 2; 19; 20B; 28 n. 1; 30;
 40; 59 (11); n. 4; 60; 65–6; 116A
eisangelia 96A–B
 Eleazar 59 n. 3; 5; 10; 63 n. 2; 64 n. 3
 Eleusinian Mysteries 7; 48
 Eleusi(nian)s 54; 162
 Eleven, the Board of 52
 Epaminondas 102 n. 2
 Ephesians 106
 Ephesus 30
 Ephialtes 156
 Epicurus 67
 Epirus 17
 Erasinides 112
 Eratosthenes of Cyrene 135A; 135C
 Eretria 22
 Erichthonius 24B n. 1
 Eteocles 83 n. 1
 Euander 147
 Euboea 22 n. 3; 158
 Eubulus 3
 —*Klepsydra* 3
 Eucles, archon 111
 Euhemerus of Messene 65
 Eumenes of Cardia 34 n. 1
 Eunomus of Thria 135B
 Eupolemus, general 46
 Eupolemus Judaeus 65

 Eupolis 121
 Euripides 83; 155
 —*Archelaus* 155 n. 3
 —*Bacchae* 115
 —*Electra* 115 n. 1
 —*Ino* 83 n. 2
 —*Iphigenia Taurica* 155 n. 3
 —*Medea* 115 n. 1
 —*Phoenissae* 115 n. 1
 —*Phrixus* 155 n. 3
 Euryclides 48
 Eurydice 1 (78); 17 n. 2
 Eustratius 69

 Fabius Pictor, Quintus 147
 Fabius Rullianus, Quintus 23D
 Favorinus of Arelate 1 (76); (77); 6 n. 1
 —*Memoirs* 1 (76)
 —*Varied Inquiry* 1 (77)
 Figulus *see* Marcius Figulus

 Galatia 116B
 Gellius, Aulus 147
 Geminus *see* Pompeius Geminus
 Geminus of Tyrus 86
 Greeks 64; 119; 124; 126; 134; 147
gynaikonomoi 153 n. 5

 Hades 116A
 Harmodius 24B n. 1; 25C
 Harpalus 1 (75)
 Hebrew(s) 58A; 60–1; 64
 Hecataeus of Abdera 59 (31); 65 n. 1
 Hegemon 15A
 Hegesander of Delphi 7
 Helen 144
 Helicon 144
 Hellespont 16A n. 1; 94
 —funds 112
 Heraclides of Pontus 1 (79); 57
 Heraclitus 106
 Hermes, pillars of 7; 53
 —Games of 162
 Hermippus of Smyrna 42 n. 2; 140;
 145; 163–4
 —*On the pupils of Isocrates* 163

- Hermocrates 147
Hermogenes of Tarsus 65
Herodotus 65 n. 1
Hesiod 55B; 157
Hieromnemon, archon 23E
Hieromus the Phoenician 66
Hieronymus of Cardia 65 n. 1
Hieronymus of Rhodes 104–5; 134
hierophant 48; 133
Himeraeus, brother of
Demetrius 13A–B; 43A
Hippias of Elis 113
Hippodamas 133
Homer 55A n. 1; 55B; 143; 145; 160
Hyperbolus 4 n. 1
Hyperides 13A–B; 96A; 100; 120 n. 1; 121 n. 1; 122; 125 n. 1
—*For Lycophron* 96A
—*In Defence of the Naturalized* 100

Iaccheion 104
Ictinus, architect 54
Idomeneus, son of Deucalion 143 n. 3
Idomeneus, the Epicurean 102; 140
Ilium 160
Iocasta 83 n. 1
Iphicles 69
Iphicrates of Athens 24B n. 1
Iphitus 113 n. 2
Isaeus 98; 163
—*On the Estate of Pyrrhus* 98
Isidorus 128 n. 1
Isocrates 37 n. 1; 69; 125 n. 1; 133–4; 155; n. 2; 163
Isthmian Games 117

Jerusalem 59 (32); n. 5; n. 10; 64 n. 3
Jews 59 (10, 11); 62
Josephus, Flavius 66
Juba, King 66

kithara 146
Kore 162
kyria ekklesia 99

Lacedaemon 87
Lachares of Athens 17 n. 3
Laches of Aixone 111
Lacritus, orator 164
Laeris of Corcyra 146
Lagus 61; 63 n. 1
Lamia 1 (76); 6 n. 1; 43B n. 1
Lamian War 18; 45 n. 1
Lampito 5; n. 1
Larensis 105 n. 1
Lemnos 21
Leobotes, son of Alcmaeon 96B
Leontini 111
Lesbos 87
Libya 47
Licinius Calvus, Gaius 122
Licymnius of Buprasium 144
Lindus 87
Loimia 6; 6 n. 1
Lycophron of Chalcis 47
Lycurgus of Athens 120 n. 1; 121 n. 1
Lycurgus of Lacedaemon 38 n. 1; 56; 113
Lycus of Rhegium 47
Lynceus of Samos 153
Lysias 112; 121 n. 1; 122; 125 n. 1
Lysimachia 23A
Lysimachus, father of Aristides I 102; n. 3; 104
Lysimachus, grandson of Aristides I 104
Lysis of Tarentum 141

Macedonia(ns) 15B; 43A; 55B; 82A–B; 156
Manetho of Egypt 66
Marathon, battle of 24A; 103
Marcius Figulus, Gaius 53; n. 2
Marcius Rutilus, Gaius 23D
Mardonius 103
Masurius 51 n. 2
mê ousa dikê 97
Megar(i)a(ns) 27; 29 n. 1; 30 n. 4; 31
Menander 1 (79); 44; 98; 153
—*Hair-Net* 153
—*The Woman-Hater* 98
Menander of Ephesus 66

- Menedemus of Eretria 64
 Menelaus 143; 144
 Metiche 3
 Miletus 87
 Miltiades 24A; 24B n. 1
 Minos 56
 Mnaseas of Lycia 65
 Monenia 157
 Moschion 43A
 Moses 66
 Munychia 15A n. 1; 16A; 21; 27; 29–31
 Museum 58B n. 2
 Mycenae 144
 Myronianus of Amastris 49
 —*Chapters on Historical Parallels* 49
 Myrtilus 3 n. 1
 Myrto 104–5

nauklaroi/naukraroi 95
 Neocles 127
 Neon 2
 Nestor 69; 143 n. 3
 Nicander 158
 —*Poisonous Animals* 158
 Nicanor 15A n. 1; 16A n. 1; 20A; 43A
 Nicocles 15A
 Nicophemus, archon 23E
 Numenius of Apamea 127

 Odysseus 69; 143 n. 3; 144–5
 Olbian mountains 116B
 Olympias 16A; 17
 Olympic Games 104; 117
 —truce 113
 Ophelas 23A
 Orope 158
 Oropus 22

 Palamedes 147
 Panactum 17; 162
 Panaetius of Rhodes 57; 84; 102; 104–5; 110
 —*On Being of Good Cheer* 84
 Panathenaea 7; 95; 162

 Pandion 24B n. 1
parastasis 98
 Patroclus 160
 Pedasus 157
 Peloponnesian War 102 n. 3
 Penelope 145
 Periander, son of Cypselus 87
 Pericles, son of Xanthippus 40; 50; 110; 112; 121; 135A
 Perimedes of Argos 144
 Peripatos, the 1 (80)
 Perseus, king of Macedonia 82A
 Persian(s) 25C; 60; 82A
 —empire 82A
 —Wars 102 n. 3
 Phaenippus, archon 103
 Phalerum 1 (75); 2; 16B n. 1; 102
 Phanostratus 1 (75); 2; 16B; 17; 152; 162
 Pharidas of Laconia 144
 Pharos 59 n. 6
 Phemius of Ithaca 144; 146
 Philaenis of Samos 89
 Philip II of Macedonia 25C; 37; n. 1; 68; 135A n. 1; 155–6
 Philip Arrhidaeus 17; n. 2
 Philo, architect 54; 132
 Philo Judaeus, the Elder 65
 Philochorus 31; 92; 96B; 111–2; 153
 —*History of Attica* 31; 153
 Philopoemen 90
 Philostephanus of Cyrene 113
 Phocion 4; n. 1; 12 n. 1; 15A; n. 1; 15B; 24B n. 1; 25B n. 2; 67; 156
 Phoenicia(ns) 43A; 65–6; 147
phorminx 146
 Phyle 162
pinakes 58B n. 3
 Piraeus 15A n. 1; 16A n. 1; 16B; 26; 27 n. 1; 28–30; 46
 Pisistratidae 92
 Pisistratus 24B n. 1; 38 n. 1; 62
 Pittacus of Mytilene 40 n. 1; 53; n. 5; 87
 Plataea, battle of 102–3
 Plato 40 n. 1; 42; 43B n. 2; 57; 60;

- 68; 93; 102 n. 2; 133; 140**
Plistarchus **46**
Plutarch **158**
Pluto **116A–B**
Polemaeus **22**
Polus of Aegina **164**
Polycrite **104**
Polyperchon **15A n. 1; 15B; 16A; 20A n. 2**
Pompeius Geminus, Gnaeus **133**
Pompeius Magnus, Gnaeus (Pompey) **110**
Pomponius Atticus, Titus **53 n. 1; 57**
Porcius Cato ‘Uticensis’, Marcus **50 n. 1**
Porcius Cato ‘Censorius’, Marcus **56**
Posidonius of Apamea **116A**
Postumus **42 n. 1**
Priene **87**
Probolus of Sparta **144**
Propylaea **110**
prosapodosis **129**
Proserpine **54**
Ptolemaeus of Mendes **66**
Ptolemaeus **22**
Ptolemy I Soter **1 (78); (79); 2; 23A n. 1; 27 n. 1; 28–30; 35–40; 48 n. 1; 58A n. 2; 59 n. 1; 4; 61**
Ptolemy II Philadelphus **1 (79); 23A; 41 n. 1; 42 n. 2; 58A–B; 59 n. 1; 5; 60–64**
Ptolemy VI Philometor **60; n. 3**
Punic War, Third **91 n. 1**
Pupius Piso, Marcus **36 n. 1**
Pydna, battle of **82A n. 2**
Pythagoras **60; 65 n. 1**
Pythian Games **144**
Pythocles **15A**
Pythodorus **111**
Python of Aenus **37**
Python of Byzantium **37**
Quintilian
—*The causes of the decline of oratory* **126 n. 2**
Rhipaeian mountains **116B**
Romans **53; 82A n. 2; 91**
Rutilus *see* Marcius Rutilus
Salamis **17; 28**
Sarapis **1 (76); 86**
Sardis **23A**
Satyrus the Peripatetic **105**
Scipio *see* Cornelius Scipio
Seleucus Nicanor **39 n. 1**
Serapeum **58B n. 2**
Sicily **42; 47; 92; 111**
Sicyon **28 n. 1**
Simonides **147**
†Sinis† **144**
Siron of Soli **43A**
skaphephoroi **101**
Socrates **11; 40 n. 1; 102; 104–5; 108 n. 1; 109; 140**
Socrates, father of Dinarchus **9B**
Solon, son of Execestides **20B n. 1; 40 n. 1; 53; 56; 85; 87; 96A; 117**
Sophocles, son of Sostratides **111**
Sophocles
—*Antigone* **115 n. 1**
—*Electra* **115 n. 1**
—*Oedipus* **115 n. 1**
Sosicrates of Rhodes **33A**
—*Successions* **33A**
Sositheus of Athens **162**
Sostratus **9B**
Sotion of Alexandria **1 (79)**
—*Successions* **1 (79)**
Spartans **56**
Sphettus, deme **152**
Stephanus [from Ephesus] **70B**
Stoa Poikile **24A**
Stobaeus **83 n. 2**
Stoics **57**
Strepsiades **95 n. 2**
Sunium, Cape **28**
Susa **156**
Teleboae **144**
Telesphorus **1 (79)**

- Telesterion 54 n. 1
 Thales, son of Examius 40 n. 1; 87; 93
 Thallus Historicus 66
 Thebes 22; 29; 30; 32
 Themistocles 4 n. 1; 34 n. 1; 35; 96B
 Theodectes of Phaselis 59 (316); 64 n. 3
 Theodorus of Cyrene 48
 Theodotus Judaeus 65
 Theon 158
 Theophilus Historicus 65
 Theophrastus 2; 9A–B; 10–1; 19; 33B n. 1; 36; 44 n. 1; 57; 65 n. 1; 67; 69 n. 1; 96A–B; 101; 119; 121; 131B
 —(*On*) *Laws* 96A–B; 101
 Theopompus of Chius 59 (314); 64 n. 3; 133
 Theseus 24B n. 1; 56; 114
 Thessaly 158
 Thracians 45
 Thrasybulus 24B n. 1
 Thrasyllus of Alexandria 108 n. 1
 Thrasyllus of Athens 112
 Thrasymachus of Chalcedon 11
 Thucydides 92; 123
 Thudippus 15A
 Timaeus of Tauromenium 51 n. 2; 89
 Timocles 153
 —*Jury-Lover* 153
 Timocrates 105 n. 3
 Timolaus of Macedonia 144
 Timotheus, son of Conon 4
 Tripods, Street of the 43A
 Trojan War 144; 157
 Troy 160 n. 1
 Tullius Cicero, Marcus 53 n. 1; 123; 125; 139 n. 1
 —Marcus, son of Cicero 119
 —Quintus, brother of Cicero 139 n. 1
 Turdetania 116A
 Tyrians 66
 Tzetzes, Johannes 148; 160 n. 1
 Ulpian 7 n. 1
 Varro 24C
 —*Hebdomades* 24C
 Volumnius Flamma Violens, Lucius 30
 Xanthippe 105
 Xanthippides 103
 Xenocrates of Chalcedon 11 n. 1; 12 n. 1; 49; 67; 131A–C
 Xenophanes of Colophon 84
 Xenophon 40 n. 1; 85; 123
 Xerxes I 25C n. 1; 35 n. 1; 94
 Zaleucus of Locri 40 n. 1
 Zeus of the Enclosure 100
 —Herkeios 100
 Zoilus of Amphipolis 133
 Zopyrion 65
 Zopyrus 92

2

Diogenes Laertius' Life of Demetrius of Phalerum

Michael G. Sollenberger

Book Five of Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the Philosophers* is dedicated to the Peripatetics, and within that Book eleven sections, about five and a half pages in the OCT edition, contain the "Life of Demetrius" (5.75–85). In piecing together the remains of Demetrius, Wehrli broke up Diogenes' continuous narrative into twenty pieces (or fifty-two, if we count book titles) and scattered them throughout his collection of 208 fragments.¹ The result is that we do not receive a proper impression of the entire "Life of Demetrius," since in the case of each fragment, the context is missing and the intelligibility of individual statements is often decreased. The new edition of the fragments of Demetrius by Peter Stork, Jan van Ophuijsen, and Tiziano Dorandi provides us with a continuous text and translation of Diogenes Laertius' "Life of Demetrius," a great service to those of us seeking to understand something about the life of the man.

Although my personal liking for Diogenes remains undiminished—he is a sensational storyteller—I want to acknowledge straightway that

¹ F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*. Bd. 4: Demetrios von Phaleron, 2nd ed. (Basel, 1967).

in the case of Demetrius, Diogenes did not do his job as well as he might have done. He cites five sources in all: Demetrius of Magnesia (5.75 = 1 SOD), Didymus (5.76 = 1), Favorinus (5.76 = 1), Hermippus (5.78 = 1 = Hermippus, fr. 58W.), and Heraclides' *Epitome* of Sotion (5.78 = fr. 69W., 1 = Sotion, fr. 18W.). Other ancient authors, however, cite many other sources for information concerning Demetrius, some of whom Diogenes used as sources in the lives of other philosophers, e.g., Duris (Athen. 12.542B = 43A–B; DL 1.22, 1.38, 1.74, 1.82, 1.89, 1.119, and 2.19), Philochorus (Dion. Hal., *De Dinarcho* 3 = 31; DL 2.44 and 9.55), and Sosicrates (Athen. 10.422C = 33A; DL 1.38, 1.49, 1.67, 1.75, 1.95, 1.101, 1.106, 1.107, 2.84, 6.13, 6.80, and 8.8). We should wonder why Diogenes did not consult these authors for Demetrius' biography, or if he did consult them, why he did not cite them as his sources.

The contents of Demetrius' life are a jumble and important events and details are omitted. In a few places Diogenes is wrong in his chronology and in others he seems to have become confused about which Demetrius he was writing (I shall give details later). To be sure, Demetrius was a very common name, so that Demetrius of Phalerum was often confused with Demetrius Poliorcetes, e.g., the clear confusions of the two in the second part of the entry in the *Suda*, s.v. "Demetrius," Δ429, Aelian, *Var. Hist.* 9.9, and also Phaedrus, *Fab.* 5.1 = 44.² Moreover, the catalogue of writings which Diogenes gives for Demetrius is not complete. Clearly this is not one of Diogenes' better "lives," for, as we can see, he has neglected—whether deliberately or inadvertently is difficult to say—information which seems to have been readily available to him.

The inclusion of Demetrius in Diogenes' book on the Peripatetics is interesting. The first four lives in Book Five are those of the successive heads of the school: Aristotle, Theophrastus, Strato, and Lyco. But then come Demetrius of Phalerum and Heraclides of Pontus, neither of whom headed the school. While Diogenes' survey of the Peripatos covers only the first century of the existence of the school, it is still problematic why he chose these particular six men. Lyco is the latest of these (d. 225 BC), so it may be that Diogenes' sources left off with him. This is, of course, Moraux's thesis, which claims that Diogenes' main source for the lives of the Peripatetic scholars (at least) was the history of the Peripatos composed by Lyco's immediate successor as head of the Ly-

² See K. Gaiser, "Menander und der Peripatos," *Antike und Abendland* 13 (1967) 9, and Wehrli 1967, 51.

ceum, Ariston of Ceos.³ Demetrius and Heraclides may have been included for any number of reasons: not only was each well known in his own right, but also each represents and illustrates the openness of the Peripatos and the widely different types which the school attracted, accepted, and accommodated. Demetrius was an Athenian citizen, something of a rarity in view of the strongly cosmopolitan student body at the Lyceum. He was Cassander's regent in Athens for ten years (317–307 BC), and was renowned as an eminent man of practical and political affairs, reportedly a prolific author on a wide range of topics, and an outstanding orator—according to Quintilian, “just about the last of the Attic school who can be called an orator” (*Inst. orat.* 10.1.80 = 125). In contrast, Heraclides was a strange and enigmatic man. He was wealthy and had a solemn and stately bearing which was surely made more conspicuous because he was obese and wore elegant clothes. In fact, Diogenes tells us his pomposity made him the target of popular derision. (D.L. 5.86). By two anecdotes we are led to believe that Heraclides was something of a prankster and very vain (D.L. 5.90–1). Perhaps, too, none of Diogenes' sources dealt with the other Peripatetics, or did not have much to say about them; then again, it may have been that Diogenes liked these two to the exclusion of any others. Whatever the case, it appears to have been a matter of personal, deliberate choice that Diogenes included these six men's lives.

Laertian lives feature regular and recurring standard *topoi* or rubrics, i.e., categories of information.⁴ We should keep in mind that these categories are the systematic means and the basic building blocks by which Diogenes attempts to characterize his subjects; they recur again and again in varying order throughout the ten books of his work. He moves very quickly in his descriptions; he does not intend to go to great length in detailing his subjects' achievements, but seeks only to provide a brief sketch of characteristic traits. Fifteen is the total number of categories, but not all categories are featured in all lives. For obvious reasons, Diogenes tells us nothing in the Life of Demetrius about his foundation of a school or succession to the leadership of a school nor about any of his students or disciples. We might have hoped for information concerning some doctrines embraced by Demetrius or the inclusion of personal

³ P. Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain, 1951) 243ff.

⁴ See M.G. Sollenberger, “The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' ‘Vitae Philosophorum’ Book V,” *ANRW* 36.6 (Berlin, 1992) 3800–4.

documents, but none is given. There is, however, information in each of the eleven other categories. I shall proceed according to these categories as they are found in the *vita Demetrii*.

1. *Origin: Homeland and Genealogy*: Demetrius hailed from the old port of Athens, Phalerum, which lies to the east of the Piraeus. Demetrius' father Phanostratus was not noble, as Diogenes reports (5.75 = 1), but that is basically all we learn from him about Demetrius' family and ancestry.

Diogenes is the only ancient author to state that Demetrius was not well-born (οὐκ εὐγενῆς ὢν), which he follows with a citation from Favorinus that he was from the house of Conon, i.e., a slave in the household of Conon (5.75 = 1). This is likely to be an anecdotal report, for it does not fit well into the other categories of information which Diogenes includes. Aelian, however, also tells us about the servitude of Demetrius, making him the servant not only of Conon, but also of his son (presumably), Timotheus (*Var. hist.* 12.43 = 4). If by Conon is meant the famous Athenian admiral and general who defeated the Spartans at Cnidos in 394 BC and completed the rebuilding of the Long Walls at Athens, Demetrius could not have been his slave, for this Conon died in 392 BC.⁵ Conon's son Timotheus, however, a pupil of Isocrates, could have been Demetrius' master, for he died in 354 BC, but this involves some chronological considerations which shall be discussed later.⁶ While Demetrius may not have been of noble birth, he was probably not a slave; Beloch called this "alberner Klatsch."⁷ Some contend that Demetrius' father Phanostratus was or had been a slave, basing their claim on the article on Demetrius in the *Suda* (Δ429 = 2). There the alternate name Phanos is recorded for Phanostratus, which was believed to have been a slave name.⁸ Wehrli, however, demonstrated that Phanos was in fact a free person's name, since it occurs as the name of a free man in Aristophanes' *Wasps* (1220) and in Demosthenes' speech *Against Aphobus* (29.23 and 58).⁹ While there may have been slaves in Demetrius' background, perhaps in the household of Conon and

⁵ See K. Swoboda, "Konon (3)," *RE* 11 (1922) 1319–32.

⁶ See Isoc. 15.9.101 and K. Klee, "Timotheos (3)," *RE* 6.2 (1937) 1324–30.

⁷ K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, 2nd ed., vol. 4.1 (Leipzig, 1925) 104 n. 2, who adds "derartiges richtet sich selbst."

⁸ See H. Herter, "Phanos (2)," *RE* 19 (1938) 1785.

⁹ Wehrli 1967, 49.

Timotheus, and there seems to be no reason to reject the statement in Athenaeus that he was raised in relative poverty (12.543F = **43**; as a youth Demetrius only ate bowls of olives of every sort and island cheese), the statement that he himself was a slave appears to be a piece of vindictive gossip which circulated about him either during the years that he was Cassander's regent in Athens, or, perhaps more likely, was ingloriously attributed to Demetrius' reputation after his fall from power.

In speaking further about Demetrius' somewhat obscure family, we should not forget his older brother Himeraeus.¹⁰ Although Diogenes makes no mention of him, Himeraeus may provide some clue about the political stance and aspirations of his younger brother. Himeraeus was an anti-Macedonian whom Antipater had executed together with Hyperides and Aristonicus after the Lamian War in October of 322 BC.¹¹ In contrast, Demetrius seems to have been more tolerant of Macedonian hegemony; and later in 322 he was chosen by the Athenians as part of a peace-seeking legation to Antipater, together with Demades, Phocion, and Xenocrates ([Dem.], *De elocutione* 2.89 = **12**; cf. Diodorus 18.18.2–3, Plut., *Vita Phocionis* 27 and DL 4.9). Interestingly, in an Arabic life of Aristotle by Ibn Abi Usaibi'a, we read that the Athenians, wishing to show their appreciation to Aristotle for all the benefits which he had brought to their city, met to draft an inscription for a dedicatory column, but it was opposed by Himeraeus.¹²

¹⁰ Himeraeus is called Demetrius' brother by Carylus ap. Athen. 12.543E = **43** and by Arrian, *Diadochoi* 13 ap. Photium, *Bibl.* 92 69b34–40 = **13A**. That he was Demetrius' older brother seems clear from the fact that he played a part in the prosecution and conviction of Harpalus according to Ps.-Plut., *Vitae decem oratorum* (Demosthenes) 846C. See also H. Berve and K. Schoch, "Himeraios," *RE* Suppl. 4 (1924) 743.

¹¹ See Plut., *Vita Demosthenis* 28.2–3, Athen. 12.542e and Ps.-Lucian, *Demosthenis encomium* 31. In his article "The Peripatetic School and Demetrius of Phalerum's Reforms in Athens," *Ancient World* 15 (1987) 87–98, J. Williams has some interesting comments about Himeraeus and his political leanings which may have influenced his brother Demetrius. See further E. Bayer, *Demetrius Phalereus der Athener*, *Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 36 (Tübingen, 1942; rpt. Darmstadt, 1969) 129–32 and W.S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens: An Historical Essay* (London, 1911; rpt. New York, 1969) 20 and 38.

¹² See I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*, *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 5 (Göteborg, 1957) 215–16 and 233–4.

2. *Education*: Theophrastus is the only person who is ever named as Demetrius' teacher—and this is the case in the writings of all ancient authors, not only Diogenes Laertius. Some scholars have conjectured that Aristotle himself may have taught Demetrius, but none of our ancient sources explicitly says this.¹³

3. *Physical Appearance/Personal Qualities*: Diogenes' descriptions of philosophers in general are notoriously brief, often caricatures.¹⁴ Diogenes' descriptions usually stress some prominent or noteworthy feature of the person's appearance. His brief descriptions of Demetrius concern his eyes: Χαριτοβλέφαρος, "having eyelids of the Graces," and "the shining or radiant one," Λαμπιτώ, after the notorious courtesan of that name (5.76 = 1, corroborated by Athen. 13.593F and *Suda* Δ429 = 2 and 5). We should note, however, how the mention of Demetrius' nicknames due to his eyes leads Diogenes by simple association¹⁵ to a third item concerning his eyes—that he is reported to have lost his sight in Alexandria and regained it from the god Sarapis of Canopus and thus wrote paeans to this deity that were still being sung in Diogenes' (?) day (5.76 = 1).¹⁶

What Duris is reported by Athenaeus to have said about Demetrius (12.542B–E = 43A–B), his lack of restraint, his excessiveness, his sordid love affairs, dyeing his hair, applying rouge and other oils, finds no counterpart in Diogenes' account. Realizing that Duris was a hostile source on Demetrius, we have to question the validity of his report. Once again we must consider possible confusion with another

¹³ For example, E.A. Parsons, *The Alexandrian Library* (New York, 1953) 215–16, E.M. and N. Wood, *Class Ideology and Ancient Political Theory* (Oxford, 1978) 250 and Williams 1987, 88, all suggest that Demetrius studied also under Aristotle.

¹⁴ O. Gigon made the suggestion that they were portraits drawn from their representation on the comic stage, "Interpretationen zu den antiken Aristoteles-Viten," *MH* 15 (1958) 151.

¹⁵ Such chaining together of similar notions is a method which Diogenes often uses. See P. Moraux, "La composition de la 'Vie d'Aristote' chez Diogène Laërce," *RÉG* 68 (1955) 156–7, id., "Diogène Laërce et le Peripatos," *Diogene Laerzio storico del pensiero antico*, *Elenchos* 7 (Naples, 1986) 258, and J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*, *Hermes Einzelschrift* 40 (Leiden, 1978) 18.

¹⁶ P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1972) 249ff., claims (267) that this is "the earliest datable evidence for the Alexandrian cult of Sarapis." According to Artemidorus, *Onirocriticon* 2.44 (= 86), Demetrius wrote a work in five books on cures provided through dreams by Sarapis.

Demetrius, viz. Demetrius Poliorcetes, about whom this same story is told by Aelian (*Var. hist.* 9.9).¹⁷

4. *Political Activities*: Diogenes tells us, on the authority of Demetrius of Magnesia, that Demetrius of Phalerum ἄρξασθαι...τῆς πολιτείας when Harpalus, fleeing Alexander, came to Athens (fr. 1). A possible translation of ἄρξασθαι τῆς πολιτείας is "he assumed the government of the city," which, however, puts Diogenes and his source, Demetrius of Magnesia, in error, for all sources report that Demetrius came to power in Athens in 317 BC. The passage is better translated as "he entered politics," or "he was registered as a citizen," once it is realized that Harpalus came to Athens in 324 BC. This statement provides us with a starting point for arriving at Demetrius' probable date of birth. Since Aristotle states (*Ath. Pol.* 42.1) that the earliest age at which one could enter politics was eighteen, Demetrius accordingly could not have been born later than 342 BC. But, since Demetrius is reported to have taken part in a legation after the battle of Crannon, which occurred in August/September 322 BC and began to rule Athens for Cassander five years later, both of which positions most likely would have demanded more age and experience, one has to wonder about Demetrius' age at his entry into politics. Bayer and Wehrli accordingly push back the date of Demetrius' birth to 350 BC.¹⁸ Later, Wehrli suggested that he may have been born as early as 360 BC, basing this on the report of Eusebius-Hieronymus that Demetrius' *floruit* was in 320 BC (*Chron.*, Ol. 115 = 1).¹⁹ Forty was considered the standard age for a man's *floruit*. I will discuss this further in *Chronological Information* below.

In mentioning Demetrius' decade of rule in Athens, Diogenes only tells us that "through public speeches before the Athenians, he was leader (ἐξηγήσατο) of the city for ten years" (5.75 = 1), neglecting to mention that he was placed in this position by Cassander or even what those ten years were. To his credit, Diogenes does not mention that

¹⁷ Wehrli 1967, 52.

¹⁸ Bayer 1942, 1; Wehrli 1967, 49; F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, Bd. I (Leipzig, 1891) 135, suggests that Demetrius was born between 354 and 348, which would make his entry into politics between the ages of 24 and 30.

¹⁹ F. Wehrli, "Demetrios," *RE Suppl.* 11 (1968) 514 and in the new Ueberweg-Praechter, "Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit," in *Grundriß der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 3: *Ältere Akademie, Aristoteles-Peripatos*, ed. H. Flashar, 559 (Basel, 1983).

Demetrius was στρατηγός three times and ἵππαρχος twice, perhaps during the brief oligarchy headed by Phocion during the period of 322/1–319/8 BC, as is recorded on the base of a statue found at Eleusis (IG II² 2971 = **162**). As Stephen Tracy shows in his article in the present collection, this inscription is to be dated no earlier than 270 BC; the Demetrius referred to can be none other than Demetrius of Phalerum's namesake grandson.

The great esteem in which Demetrius was held by the Athenians during his regency—most likely in return for what Diogenes says, that “he achieved many splendid results working for the city, as he added to the city both sources of revenue and buildings” (5.75 = **1**)—is shown by the statement that 360 bronze statues were dedicated to him, depicting him either as an equestrian or driving a team of horses. Diogenes curiously adds here that it took less than 300 days to complete these statues (5.75 = **1**). Others give different numbers of statues dedicated to Demetrius Nepos says 300 (*Miltiades* 6 = **24A**) as does Plut., *Praec. ger. rei publ.* 28 820e = **25B**); Strabo (9.1.20 = **19**) says more than 300; [Dio Chrysostom] says 1500 (*Corinthiaca* 37.41 = **25C**), while Pliny (*NH* 34. 12.27 = **25A**) and Nonius (*De compendiosa doctrina* 12 = **24C**) report, like Diogenes, that there were 360 statues.

In dealing with Demetrius' fall from power in Athens, while others attribute his eclipse to the capture of Athens from Cassander by Demetrius Poliorcetes, Diogenes attributes it simply to “all-consuming envy” without further explanation (5.76 = **1**).²⁰ But at this point in his narrative Diogenes gets his chronology wrong. He says, “Impeached by certain people for a capital offense, he was sentenced to death *in absentia*” (5.77 = **1**). Demetrius' accusation for treason and sentencing to death, however, may not have occurred in 307, when he fell from power, but in April of 318 BC, when he was condemned along with Phocion and his followers, as we learn from Plutarch (*Vita Phocionis* 35 = **15A**) and Cornelius Nepos (*Phocion* 3 = **15B**). We must wonder if the same sort of chronological error is not lurking in the words of Philochorus as reported by Dionysius of Harlicarnassus (*De Dinarcho* 3 = **31**). Inter-

²⁰ Interestingly, Theophrastus is credited with the following: “The same man (Theophrastus), when asked what gain there is in government, said: ‘Envy’” (610 FHS&G = *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 335 Sternbach [*Wiener Studien* 10 (1888) 260]); see W. Fortenbaugh, *Quellen zur Ethik Theophrasts* (Amsterdam, 1984) 157–9. One cannot resist wondering if Theophrastus arrived at this conclusion after seeing his pupil and friend toppled from power.

estingly enough, when Demetrius had anticipated that the Athenians wanted revenge for his collaboration with Macedonia at this time (i.e., 318 BC), he fled to the Macedonian garrison in Munychia which was then commanded by none other than Nicanor, the nephew, brother-in-law, probable son-in-law, and adopted son, of Aristotle (Diodorus 18.64.1ff.; cf. Athen 12.542E = **43A**).²¹

We learn from other sources that Demetrius fled to Thebes, where he lived in exile for nine or ten years.²² Diogenes makes no mention of this at all; neither does Cicero (cf. *De fin.* 5.19.53 = **36**). He is more intent to tell us the sordid details of Demetrius' ruin in Athens, namely, how the Athenians, not able to get hold of Demetrius himself, desecrated the statues of him, selling some, tossing others into the sea, and cutting others up for use as chamber pots (5.76 = **1**).²³ *Sic transit gloria mundi!* But then Diogenes adds that one statue of Demetrius was spared, preserved on the Acropolis. This looks to be what Mejer, in his book on Diogenes Laertius, called "author's remarks";²⁴ Diogenes is telling us that he himself has seen the sole surviving statue of Demetrius of Phalerum in Athens. Due to this intrusion, one has to wonder to what the information from Favorinus which follows refers: "The Athenians did this (τοῦτο) on the orders of Demetrius the King" (5.76 = **1**) It seems to indicate that Demetrius Poliorcetes ordered one statue of Demetrius of Phalerum to be preserved. But this is hardly likely to have been the case. The τοῦτο most likely refers to the tearing down of the statues of Demetrius and disposal of them in various ways. Diogenes tags on to this, again lifting information from Favorinus, that the year in which Demetrius was the eponymous archon at Athens, i.e., 309/8 BC, was registered, presumably after his flight in 307, as the year of lawlessness (5.76 = **1**).

²¹ See esp. Ferguson 1911, 32–7, and Düring 1957, 62–3.

²² Polyaeus, *Strategemata* 3.15 = **45**, Diodorus 20.45.4 = **30**, and Plut., *Vita Demetrii* 9.3 = **29**.

²³ Juvenal 10.61–4, reports the same about the likenesses of Sejanus, when he fell from power; see B. Lavagnini, "Motivi diatribici in Giovenale," *Athenaeum* 27 (1947) 87–8. Nero suffered a similar *damnatio memoriae* according to Pliny, *Panegyricus* 52, as did also Demades, according to Plut., *Praec. ger. rei publicae* 27 820F = Demetrius, **25B**. See in general L. Jerphagnon, "Damnatio memoriae: Essai sur le traitement des nuisances de l'histoire," in *Du banal au merveilleux. Mélanges offerts à Lucien Jerphagnon*. Cahiers de Fontenay, nos. 55–7 (Fontenay-Saint Cloud, 1989) 7–49. I am grateful to Tiziano Dorandi for this last reference.

²⁴ Mejer 1978, 53–4.

Diogenes recounts later in his narrative, actually outside what we might call his “biography proper,” that when Demetrius was being viciously prosecuted (ἐσυκοφαντεῖτο), Menander, the comic poet, was nearly hauled into court (in 307 BC?) for no other reason than that he was a friend of Demetrius (5.79 = 1). He adds that Telesphorus, the cousin of Demetrius, intervened and saved him from this fate.²⁵ This appears to be another instance of “author’s remarks,” for Diogenes interrupts the report, saying parenthetically, “for I learn this, too.” He neglects again, however, to mention his source. Indeed, other friends and associates of Demetrius were prosecuted or forced to answer accusations at this time, namely Dinarchus and Theophrastus and the schools of philosophers.²⁶

As mentioned earlier, Diogenes omits mention of the events which transpired in Demetrius’ life while he is said to have lived in exile in Thebes, from 307/6 to 298/7 or 297/6 BC.²⁷ Instead, when we recapture the thread of Diogenes’ narrative back in the “biography proper,” he shifts abruptly to the report from Hermippus that when Cassander died (298/7 BC, i.e., ten years after Demetrius’ flight from Athens), Demetrius fled to Ptolemy I Soter in Egypt (5.78 = 1 = Hermippus, fr. 58W.).²⁸ He spent some time at the court of Ptolemy and served as an advisor to the king. One specific piece of advice which Diogenes tells us Demetrius gave to Ptolemy was that he should confer royal power on his children by his wife Eurydice (5.78 = 1). Diogenes explains very little to us here. We know that Eurydice was Antipater’s daughter—thus the sister of Cassander—and the aunt of Ptolemy Soter’s other, later wife and

²⁵ See D. Potter, “Telesphoros, Cousin of Demetrius: A Note on the Trial of Menander,” *Historia* 36 (1987) 491–5, and D. Wiles, “Menander’s *Dyskolos* and Demetrios of Phaleron’s Dilemma: A Study of the Play in Its Historical Context—The Trial of Phokion, the Ideals of a Moderate Oligarch, and the Rancour of the Disenfranchised,” *G&R* 31 (1984) 170–9.

²⁶ Dinarchus (Ps.-Plut. *Vitae decem oratorum* 850C–E and Dion. Hal. *De Dinarcho* 2); Theophrastus and other philosophers (DL 5.38, Alexis Comicus ap. Athen. 13.610F, Pollux, *Onomasticon* 9.42; cf. Athen. 11.508F; for a general overview, see Ferguson 1911, 95–108.

²⁷ Diodorus 20.45.2 = 30 and Plut. *Vita Demetrii* 9.3 = 29, say that Demetrius fled first to Thebes provided with safe conduct by Demetrius Poliorcetes. Plutarch adds that Demetrius of Phalerum had more to fear from the Athenians than the enemy.

²⁸ Ptolemy Soter invited many poets and philosophers to his court at Alexandria, notably Theophrastus, who declined (DL 5.37), and Strato, who accepted, becoming tutor to Ptolemy Philadelphus (DL 5.58 = fr. 1W. and the *Suda*, s.v. Στράτων, Σ1185 = fr. 25W.)

stepsister, Berenike. Eurydice was also the mother of Ptolemy Ceraunus, and this was the son whom Demetrius advised Ptolemy to name as his heir. Diogenes tells us that Ptolemy did not listen to Demetrius' advice, but instead gave the power to his son by Berenike, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, whose name Diogenes does not mention.²⁹ When Ptolemy I Soter died in 283/2 (he had made his son Philadelphus joint ruler in 285), Philadelphus thought it fitting to have Demetrius guarded in the countryside—perhaps he knew about Demetrius' advice to his father that he not be invested with the royal power—until he should make some decision about him.³⁰ Demetrius eventually died in confinement from a snake bite. I shall have more to say about this in the section on death.

Immediately after the notice of Demetrius' death, Diogenes parades out his own epigram on Demetrius. In most lives these verses signal the end of what I have called the "biography proper." As a result, it comes as something of a surprise to find, after the epigram, a citation from Heraclides' (Lembus'?) *Epitome* of Sotion's *Successions* (Sotion, fr. 18W.), in which Demetrius' own words are quoted: "When Ptolemy (Soter) wanted to hand over his kingdom to his son Philadelphus, Demetrius tried to dissuade him, saying, 'What you give to another, you don't have'" (5.78 = 1). Hermippus, whom Diogenes had cited earlier for the account of the succession to the throne of Egypt and Demetrius' death by a snake bite, seems not to have reported these words of Demetrius, although they would have fit well into his account which Diogenes lifted from Hermippus' work. Then Diogenes appends a further afterthought dealing with the near trial of Menander mentioned earlier (5.79 = 1), which concludes the "biography proper" and leads into the list of Demetrius' writings.

5. Other Important Items: Under this rubric I have placed other information included by Diogenes which does not fit well under others. Diogenes had mentioned on the authority of the *Memorabilia* of Favorinus that Demetrius had been a member of the household of Conon (5.75 = 1 = Favorinus, fr. 7 Mensching). Shortly thereafter, Diogenes again cites the same work of Favorinus for the statement that

²⁹ See Fraser 1972, 321ff., and F.M. Heichelheim, "Berenice (1)," *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1970) 165.

³⁰ See Wehrli 1968, 560.

Demetrius suffered violence at the hands of Cleon (Favorinus, fr. 11 Mensching). Von der Mühl and Wehrli suggested that we should read Conon for Cleon.³¹ In connection with this we can observe that in the *Suda* entry for Demetrius it is reported that “He (Demetrius) was so good-looking that he was even slanderously said to have been the beloved of Neon” (Δ429 = 2). Here again the name looks suspicious and Wehrli and Mensching, considering a similar confusion, suggest changing Neon to Cleon or perhaps Conon.³² If we read the two fragments together and insert Cleon (or Conon?) in both, we have a curious bit of information. Demetrius of Phalerum was the beloved of Cleon (or Conon) and suffered violence at his hands. Whether this is a case of sexual abuse is difficult to decide.

The first sentence after Diogenes’ catalogue of Demetrius’ writings seems to be a general yet very positive remark on Demetrius’ literary style: “His style is philosophical mixed with a rhetorical intensity” (5.82 = 85). Diogenes probably did not read Demetrius’ writings himself, so this must be the judgment of one of his sources. Perhaps most striking is the fact that Diogenes makes no mention whatsoever of Demetrius’ connection with the establishment of the library and museum in Alexandria, although many other authors have much to say about this.³³

6. *Anecdotes*: Lamia, or Lameia, was Athenian, the daughter of Cleanor, according to Polemon as quoted by Athenaeus (13.577C), but probably not εὐγενής, although Diogenes asserts as much on the authority of Favorinus (5.76 = 1 = Favorinus, fr. 7 Mensching), for she is said to have been an αὐλητρίς (“flute-girl”) by Machon as quoted by Athenaeus (13.577E). Still, Demetrius may have been involved with her in some sort of amorous relationship, probably before she became the beloved of Demetrius Poliorcetes.³⁴ It is not certain whether he married her or anyone else, although Diogenianus-Choeroboscus registers her as his γυνή (*Orthographia* [Cramer, *Anecd. Gr. Oxon.* 2.239 = 6]), but it

³¹ Wehrli 1967, 14 (*app. crit.* to fr. 38); von der Mühl is credited with this conjecture by E. Mensching (ed.), *Favorin von Arelate: Der erste Teil der Fragmente. Memorabilien und Omnigena Historia. Texte und Kommentare* 3 (Berlin, 1963) 80.

³² Wehrli 1967, 14 (*app. crit.* to fr. 36); Mensching 1963, 81 n. 4.

³³ See 39, 40, 58B, 59 and 61–3.

³⁴ Jacoby, *FGrH* IIB.643. See the remarks of Mensching 1963, 74, who professes his belief that there is here another confusion of Demetrius of Phalerum with Demetrius Poliorcetes.

seems clear that Demetrius had at least one child, for Athenaeus (4.167E–F = 7) quotes Hegesander about a grandson of Demetrius, likewise named Demetrius, who was made into one of the six *thesmothetai* at Athens by Antigonos Gonatas in the third century BC.³⁵

7. *Apophthegms/Sayings*: Diogenes introduces all sorts of utterances into his accounts of philosophers' lives. Like the anecdotes which Diogenes also regularly includes about his subjects and with which characteristic sayings are often found, a philosopher's words in certain circumstances or situations serve to illustrate his character, to present his ἦθος, and this appears to have been Diogenes' main purpose, not to demonstrate his πρόξεις or intellectual achievements.³⁶

Diogenes offers us eight sayings of Demetrius, only one of which has anything like a context, i.e., the one about how he felt about the destruction of his statues (5.82 = 1).³⁷ The rest are given one after the other with no background information to aid our understanding about the circumstances under which the words were said. It is worth noting that the sayings of Demetrius are not made an integral part of his biography but occur in a separate and separable section of the narrative, after his catalogue of writings.³⁸ It is possible that Diogenes merely lifted these sayings from some collection, for gnomologies and anthologies did indeed exist in Diogenes' time and perhaps even earlier.³⁹ It must also be recognized that often the attribution of an utterance to a particular individual

³⁵ On this Demetrius (now to be identified with the subject of the inscription IG II² 2971) see the remarks of Stephen Tracy in the present collection and in *Political Activities* above.

³⁶ Mejer 1978, 91 and Sollenberger 1992, 3839–40.

³⁷ The same saying is attributed to Aristides with only one minor difference—κατέβαλον for κατέστρεψαν—in the Gnomologium Vaticanum no. 48 (see L. Sternbach, "De gnomologio Vaticano inedito I," *Wiener Studien* 9 [1887] 197 and H. Gottschalk, "Addenda Peripatetica," *Phronesis* 18 [1973] 93).

³⁸ Much like the sayings which Diogenes attributes to Aristotle (5.17–21) and others.

³⁹ Collections of sayings are claimed to have existed as early as the fourth century BC; see O. Schulthess, "Γνώμη," *RE* 7 (1912) 1481–1500, W. Gemoll, *Das Apophthegma: Literarhistorische Studien* (Wien and Leipzig, 1924) 34ff., K. Horna and K. von Fritz, "Gnome, Gnomendichtung, Gnomologia," *RE Suppl.* 6 (1935) 74–89, F. Wehrli, "Gnome, Anecdote und Biographie," *MH* 30 (1973) 193–208, and J. F. Kindstrand, "Diogenes Laertius and the 'Chriae' Tradition," *Diogene Laerzio storico del pensiero antico*. Elenchos 7 (Naples, 1986) 233–8. Demetrius himself is credited with what seem to have been collections of sayings, e.g., Χρειῶν α' (5.81 = 1) and Τῶν ἐπὶ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα (Stob. *Ecl.* 3.1.172 = 87); see Wehrli's comments *ad loc.* (1967, 68–70).

can be questioned; unless we find the words in the works of that person, there is little way to determine whether the attribution is indeed correct. A single saying is often found attributed to many different people or is found attributed to the same person a second time in only slightly changed form. Given the easy transferability of sayings from one person to another, their “floating” nature, we should do well to be cautious about their attribution to a particular individual.⁴⁰ Diogenes himself may have been wary of this, for he adds after the last saying of Demetrius that “All these sayings *seem* (δοκεῖ) to be attributed to him” (DL 5.83 = 1).

Due to the impersonal nature of most of Demetrius’ sayings Wehrli suggested that they were excerpted from some of his speeches or literary works.⁴¹ The themes of the sayings, mostly ethical and political, partly support this suggestion: his reaction to the desecration of his statues (perhaps from his memoirs, *Περὶ τῆς δεκαετίας* or *Ἀθηναίων καταδρομή*), luck or chance accompanies wealth—the blind leading the blind (perhaps from his work *Περὶ τύχης*), the power of the eyebrows to dominate the face may have been part of one of his rhetorical writings. The others, however, are hard to assign to specific works: how to deal with proudly arrogant people, political eloquence is like steel is in battle, the honor and respect which children owe to others, and a sneering statement about a pompous young man.

8. Chronological Information: Diogenes gives us few firm indications of dates in the life of Demetrius. First he tells us that Demetrius “ἄρξασθαι τῆς πολιτείας when Harpalus, fleeing from Alexander, came to Athens” (5.75 = fr. 6W.). As has been seen, if we take these words to mean that Demetrius entered political life in this year (324 BC) as is most probable, the very latest that he could have been born would have been 342 BC, since youths were registered as citizens at the age of eighteen. Bayer and Wehrli⁴² force back Demetrius’ date of birth, perhaps to 350 and later Wehrli⁴³ pushes Demetrius’ birth back even further, to 360 BC, based on the Eusebius-Hieronymus report, “Demetrius

⁴⁰ See J. Fairweather, “Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers,” *Ancient Society* 5 (1974) 266–7, and Wehrli 1973, 193–208.

⁴¹ Wehrli 1967, 70 and 1968, 519–20.

⁴² Bayer 1942, 1 and Wehrli 1967, 49.

⁴³ See n. 19 above.

Falereus habetur illustris" (*Chron.*, O1. 115 [i.e., 320 BC] = 14), which I consider equivalent to a statement about Demetrius' *floruit*.

Diogenes also states that Demetrius fled to Ptolemy after Cassander died, i.e., in 297/6, omitting mention of what transpired in the intervening years (307/6–297/6). Since Diogenes relates that Demetrius was imprisoned by Ptolemy Philadelphus and died from a snake bite (5.78 = 1), it seems best to say that Demetrius did not die before 285 BC, when Philadelphus was made joint ruler with his father, and probably did not die until after Ptolemy Soter died and his son became sole monarch in 283/2 BC.

Thus, if Demetrius were born in 342 BC at the very latest, we can reckon that he died at least at the age of 59 or 60, or if we adopt as his year of birth 350 BC, at the age of 67 or 68 or, at the most, if we accept Wehrli's suggestion that he was born in 360 BC, at the age of 77 or 78. More precise figures than this seem impossible, given the present state of our information.

9. *Death*: Diogenes rarely concerns himself with the date of his subject's death; he is more interested in the manner and circumstances of death. Although one naturally expects to read an account of a person's death in a biography, death—especially the manner of death—was a particular fascination of most ancient biographers, and the description of amazing and incredible deaths of famous people became firmly established as a distinct and standard *topos* in Hellenistic biography. Hermippus was clearly one biographer who indulged in this curious predilection,⁴⁴ as we can judge from the many accounts of philosophers' deaths which Diogenes reports from Hermippus.⁴⁵

Diogenes tells us that Demetrius, having been imprisoned in the Egyptian countryside by Ptolemy Philadelphus, spent his last days in dejection (ἀθυμότερον) and died in his sleep from the effects of a snake bite. He was buried in the precinct of Busiris in the delta of the Nile near Diospolis (5.78 = 1). Diogenes leads the reader to believe that the snake

⁴⁴ F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Suppl. 1: Hermippos der Kallimacheer (Basel, 1974) 105; see also A. Ronconi, "Exitus illustrium virorum," *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*, Bd. 6, ed. T. Klauser, 1258–68 (Stuttgart, 1966).

⁴⁵ I.e., 1.72, 2.13, 2.109, 2.120, 2.142, 3.2, 4.44, 5.78, 5.91, 6.99–100, 9.4, 9.27, 9.43, and 10.15.

bite was an accident, especially from his vague use of πῶς, “somehow.” Jacoby,⁴⁶ designating the assassination as being due to *libido regis*, believed that Ptolemy was responsible for Demetrius’ death, basing this on what Cicero reports: “We hear that the man ... was deprived of life in that very same Egyptian kingdom when an asp was applied to his body” (*Pro Rabirio Postumo* 9.23 = 42). Diogenes’ account, however, does not support the suggestion that Ptolemy had Demetrius executed, but rather that it was a case of suicide.⁴⁷ Suicide is indeed regularly the result in tales featuring the ἄθυμια-death motif, i.e., the advisor who has fallen into disfavor with the monarch, and as a result has become despondent (Demetrius ἄθυμότερον διῆγε, writes Diogenes) and in the examples often given in works entitled Περὶ φυγῆς. This motif of ἄθυμια in connection with a person’s death occurs elsewhere in Diogenes’ work and in two other instances when he is taking information from Hermippus: e.g., 1.95, 2.112, 2.142 (Hermippus, fr. 38 W.), 4.3, 6.99 (Hermippus, fr., 39W.).⁴⁸

10. *Writings*: Diogenes is due many thanks for having preserved a list of writings for as many philosophers as he has. While these lists may sadden us because they highlight how very little of an individual philosopher’s output has come down to us, they also afford us a glance at the sort of research and study in which an individual engaged. Moreover, since titles can disclose general interests and thus give us some idea of career patterns or aspirations, and even reveal character, we should look at them closely.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ F. Jacoby, *FGrH* IIB p. 643.

⁴⁷ So believed C. Ostermann, *Commentatio de Demetrii Phalerei vita, rebus gestis et scriptorum reliquiis* [Hersfeld and Fulda, 1847 and 1857] 2.15 and E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 3rd ed., Bd. 2.2 (Leipzig, 1879) 898. F. Susemihl, however, in *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit* (Leipzig, 1891–2) 1:139 n. 695, writes: “Von einem Selbstmord ... ist hier keine Rede.”

⁴⁸ See Wehrli 1974, 105 and W. Cronert, *Kolotes und Menedemos* (Leipzig, 1906) 2–3.

⁴⁹ Diogenes himself says several times that a man’s writing can help to reveal his nature and character, e.g., 2.56, 2.63, 3.23, 3.34, 6.14, 7.180, 7.185, 9.1, and 9.28; see also D. R. Stuart, “Author’s Lives as Revealed in their Works: A Critical Résumé,” *Classical Studies in Honor of J. C. Rolfe*, ed G. Hadzsits (Philadelphia, 1931) 301; Fairweather 1974, 233–6, and Mejer 1978, 3.

Diogenes includes a list of Demetrius' writings containing 45 titles (5.80–1). All except one of the first nine titles consists of more than one book; all the rest are monographs. The arrangement is according to subject matter or thematic content, but there are problems here.⁵⁰ In his introduction to the catalogue, Diogenes gives what look to be subject-headings, for he writes: "Of these books, some are historical, some political, some about poets, some rhetorical, collections of both public speeches and ambassadorial speeches, but also of Aesop's fables and many others" (5.80 = 1).

In the list which follows, the titles start to follow the groupings mentioned in the introduction, but after the ninth title we get a series of ten titles of dialogues (beginning with Πτολεμαῖος α'). After these the list resumes with political works, historical works, etc. Jacoby made the attractive suggestion that this list really consists of two separate catalogues, an original and a supplement.⁵¹ This may be supported in part by the double occurrence of a work Περὶ νόμων in one book in two different places in the catalogue. We may note further that the second list is less systematically organized than the first; maybe there is no order.

There are a number of titles of works omitted by Diogenes or his source(s), for we find them cited by other authors.⁵² It would be helpful to know what Diogenes' source was. No one to my knowledge has ever made a solid identification and I am not in a position to do so now.⁵³ Most likely it was not Hermippus, for he appears to have used definite schemes in listing: e.g., alphabetization, as in the case of Theophrastus' writings.⁵⁴ Moreover, the absence of any stichometric notice in Demetrius' list may indicate that it was not derived from an Alexandrian source, for indicating the number of στίχοι or ἔπη of a work or corpus of

⁵⁰ Likewise, the catalogue of writings which Diogenes gives for Heraclides of Pontus (5.86–8) is in large measure arranged according to subject or thematic content. See F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Bd. 7: *Herakleides Pontikos*, 2nd ed. (Basel, 1967–8) 64–5.

⁵¹ Jacoby, *FGrH* II B p. 643.

⁵² See Wehrli 1967, 56.

⁵³ U. von Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos*. *Philologische Untersuchungen* 4 (Berlin, 1881) 46 and E. Martini, "Demetrios (85)," *RE* 4 (1901) 2828, tentatively suggested Hermippus.

⁵⁴ 5.42–50. See K. Usener, *Analecta Theophrastea* (Diss. Bonn: Leipzig, 1858) 22–4 (rpt. in *Kleine Schriften*. ed. L. Radermacher, vol. I [Leipzig, 1912]), O. Regenbogen, "Theophrastos (3)," *RE Suppl.* 7 (1940) 1366–9, and Sollenberger 1992, 3854–5.

works became a common practice in Alexandria in the third century BC.⁵⁵ Interestingly enough, in his introduction to the book list Diogenes unequivocally states: “In the number of his books and verses (or “lines” στίχοι) he surpassed almost all Peripatetics of his time” (5.80 = 1). Even so, Diogenes gives us no actual total of lines for Demetrius’ works. Moreover, the forty-five titles listed, most of them in one book, do not correspond with his contention that he wrote more than almost all of his contemporaries.

11. Homonyms: We frequently find a list of people appended to Diogenes’ “Lives”—lists not only of philosophers or writers, but also of other artists and persons of note—who had the same name as the subject of the life he is composing. Lists of namesakes were incorporated early into biographies, perhaps they were a feature of Callimachus’ *Pinakes*, being transmitted along with the biographies which Diogenes and others used as their sources. The mid-first century BC work of Demetrius of Magnesia, *On Poets and Authors of the Same Name*, will have been, by virtue of its title alone, a major source for these lists of namesakes. Although Diogenes clearly had access to Demetrius’ work,⁵⁶ it would be rash to assume that in every case such a list in its present form in Diogenes has been taken from Demetrius of Magnesia, and in the case of the life of Demetrius of Phalerum, Diogenes does not cite his source for the list.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, some lists may ultimately derive from Demetrius of Magnesia’s work, that is, through intermediate sources. For there were other authors with a pinacographical bent who also incorporated lists of namesakes and whom Diogenes may have used as a source: e.g., Apollonius and Favorinus, in his *Memorabilia*.

⁵⁵ Of the five Peripatetics for whom Diogenes provides a book catalogue, he gives a stichometric notice only in the cases of Aristotle, Strato, and Theophrastus. On this feature of Alexandrian bibliographic practice, see T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Literatur* (Berlin, 1882) 204–5, 214, and 286. K. Ohly, “Stichometrische Untersuchungen,” *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft 61 (Leipzig, 1928) 4–22, and R. Blum, *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnung bei den Griechen* (Frankfurt, 1977) 124 and 238ff., now available in English as *The Alexandrian Library and the Origin of Bibliography*, tr. H.H. Wellisch. Wisconsin Studies in Classics (Madison, 1991).

⁵⁶ Mejer 1978, 38–9.

⁵⁷ There are forty-three instances of homonym-listings in Diogenes’ work and in only two of them does he cite his source—Demetrius of Magnesia (1.38 and 1.79; perhaps 8.84 is another instance where he used Demetrius, since he is named just before this).

In his *vita* of Demetrius of Phalerum, it will be noticed that Diogenes does not simply offer a barren list of names, but for each Demetrius there is some distinctive, individualizing feature, trait, or achievement which sets each person apart from others who had the same name. In his regular manner Diogenes reserves the list as a separate, detachable section in the "life," and, as usual, but not always, at the tail end of his narrative. Further, there is a discernible order to the twenty Demetrii in this list, as Mejer has shown:⁵⁸ prose writers are separated from poets (as we expect from the title of Demetrius of Magnesia's book) and the listing in each section is not systematic but mostly chronological, although not completely so. All of the men listed are prior to Demetrius of Magnesia, but not all the famous or well-known Demetrii are listed; notable exceptions are Demetrius of Sparta and the Jewish Demetrius.⁵⁹

Although Diogenes has not provided us with all the information which seems to have been readily available to him, he has given us some details that we would otherwise not know. He did adopt his standard means of composition by "rubrics," which brings the life of Demetrius of Phalerum at least formally into line with others. While some of these reports are of questionable value and historicity, and when we have gotten rid of what can be shown to be wrong or fictitious, the meager amount with which we are left still helps us to know something about Demetrius of Phalerum. When we supplement Diogenes' account with information from other authors, our picture of the man does become a bit clearer, but with this, too, we must beware of errors, mistakes, and intentional falsehoods. Thus, however faded and brief are the glimpses we get of this man, Demetrius of Phalerum, we can still arrive at an impression of who he was, what he was like, and what others thought of him.

⁵⁸ J. Mejer, "Demetrius of Magnesia: On Poets and Authors of the Same Name," *Hermes* 109.4 (1981) 462.

⁵⁹ Mejer 1981, 462.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

3

Demetrius of Phalerum: Who was He and Who was He Not?

Stephen V. Tracy

St. Dow, *In Memoriam*

To begin with some of my conclusions (as well as to pick up on my title), Demetrius of Phalerum, contrary to what is generally believed, *was not* a military man, clearly not a dictator, probably not an anti-democratic tyrant, and certainly not an irrational megalomaniac who erected a statue of himself on every Athenian streetcorner. He *was* a talented negotiator, a competent lawgiver, and quite a respectable scholar and philosopher. Indeed, he deserves to be regarded, far more than he currently is, as a serious literary figure. He certainly played a crucial role in the Peripatos *and*, I shall strongly argue, in the foundation of the library at Alexandria.¹

¹ See also the chapter on Demetrius in my recent book, *Athenian Democracy in Transition: Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1995) 36–51 and the bibliography cited in note 1 on page 36. Some sections of the present paper inevitably draw on ideas presented in the book though I have adapted them and expanded as necessary.

Demetrius was *also* not—and this will at first seem a silly thing to claim—identical with his grandson. It is not after all a matter of general knowledge that he had a grandson *and namesake* who was a prominent leader in Athens just after the Chremonidean War, that is toward the middle of the third century B.C. Modern scholarship understandably therefore has completely confused Demetrius and his grandson. We will have occasion to deal with this point in more detail later. Demetrius the Elder or the famous Demetrius, as I shall refer to him, became ruler of Athens in 317 B.C. when he was about 35 to 40 years of age and ruled for a decade.

He came to power as the result of an agreement between the Athenians and Kassander, the son of Antipater and ruler of northern Greece. Part of the arrangements called for the placement of a Macedonian garrison under a Macedonian commandant in Piraeus. It was Demetrius' singular misfortune that his regime was the second one imposed by the Macedonians on the Athenians in a space of less than five years. Even in the best of circumstances people have little tolerance for foreign soldiers in their midst. The first regime put in place by the Macedonians was the oligarchy of the years 321 to 319 led by Phokion and Demades. This oligarchy came about in the aftermath of the Athenian defeat in the Lamian war. Krateros and Antipater, the victorious Macedonian generals in that war, stationed a garrison in Piraeus for the first time in mid-September of 322 and demanded the condemnation of the democratic leaders of the unsuccessful war effort against them. Demosthenes, as a consequence, committed suicide on Poros rather than be taken by Antipater's agents.

This concatenation of events, viz. the death of Demosthenes and the imposition of a foreign garrison, has often been taken—wrongly, in my view—to mark the end of Athenian democracy. Indeed, I would suggest that this viewpoint has pre-conditioned most scholars, ancient and modern, to label as oligarchic any regime associated with the Macedonians and, more specifically, to fail to appreciate the positive accomplishments of our Demetrius. History, in short, has not been kind to Demetrius.

In modern sources he is very often characterized as a military dictator and tyrant. William Scott Ferguson, whose book *Hellenistic Athens* is still very influential, describes him as a “political dictator” on page 39 and on page 47 adds “for year after year he was elected general of

Athens.”² W. W. Tarn in volume 6 of the first edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History* page 480 says that “Demetrius really governed Athens as a tyrant with Cassander’s support.” The authors of volume 7 of the second edition do better by Demetrius giving more emphasis to his positive role as adviser to the first Ptolemy. Peter Green on pages 44 to 45 of his 1990 *magnum opus*, *Alexander to Actium*, does see that Demetrius was a philosopher-king, but his view of him is rather less than favorable.³ On page 45, for example, he writes of his regime: “What happened was, nothing happened: it is remarkable how much of Demetrius’ legislation was merely negative...” He also repeats the idea that Demetrius was elected general year after year.⁴ Some of the ancient sources even report that like some crazed megalomaniac he set up hundreds of statues of himself all over Athens. The figures range from 300 to 1500 bronze statues.⁵

While the ancient sources are largely negative, there are notable exceptions—Cicero,⁶ Strabo,⁷ Diodoros,⁸ and Diogenes Laertios⁹ judge him quite positively. The hostility towards Demetrius arose first of all, as I have just intimated, because of his association with the Macedonians, above all Kassander who became his political mentor. Kassander put him in place and Demetrius did not have the power to rid Athens of the hated Macedonian garrison. In addition, Demetrius attempted to control personal expenditures for show by limiting the amount that could be spent on such important family events as weddings and funerals. No doubt many resented this as an intrusion into their private affairs; predictably, they responded with attacks on Demetrius’ private life.¹⁰

² *Hellenistic Athens* (Chicago: Ares Publishers 1974 [unchanged reprint of the London edition of 1911]).

³ *Alexander to Actium* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1990).

⁴ So too C. Mossé, *La tyrannie dans la Grèce antique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1969) 155–66, who does nevertheless present Demetrius in rather favorable terms as “le tyran philosophe.”

⁵ [Dio Chrysost.] *Oratio* 37.41 (1500), D.L. 5.75 (360), Pliny the Elder *Nat.Hist.* 34.12.27 (360), Strabo 9.1.20 (300+), Plutarch *Mor.* 820E (300), Nepos *Miltiades* 6 (300).

⁶ *De Legibus* 3.6.14.

⁷ 9.1.20.

⁸ 18.74.3.

⁹ 5.75.

¹⁰ On his sumptuary measures see Philochoros in F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der*

There *were* other factors—he was a philosopher and philosophers were always suspected of being anti-democratic; that label could easily be pinned on him. Think, for example, of Socrates. Moreover, Demetrius himself had clear connections with Aristotle's school and could easily be depicted as pro-Macedonian.

Finally there was the big lie perpetrated by his successors. The victors tend after all to have the last say. When Demetrius (soon to be called) Poliorketes and his father King Antigonos seized Athens and removed Demetrius of Phalerum in the year 307, they posed as liberators and the restorers of democracy. What else would they have claimed? The labels and sloganeering of the time were, if it is possible, even more cynical than in present-day politics. Their real objective was to take control of Athens, thus weakening Kassander. This they accomplished. They crushed Kassander's garrison in Piraeus. They were, on this account, above all eagerly embraced by the Athenians as liberators. It was in connection with these events that the story of the large numbers of statues of Demetrius gained currency. The jubilant citizens, so the story went, in the course of destroying them even made some into chamberpots, unless of course it was statues of Demades to which they did this!¹¹ The confusion in our sources concerning this colorful detail should be warning enough about the factual accuracy of the account.¹² Furthermore, if this really happened, and in the huge numbers reported, the stone bases of these statues would surely have been reused and some of them at least should have survived. Yet, as we shall see, not a single one has with certainty.

The view of our Demetrius as a military leader was solidified by the discovery at Eleusis in the late 18th century of *IG II² 2971*, a statue base of Demetrius of Phalerum. This base revealed that he had enjoyed a distinguished military career and been a cavalry leader and then general on at least three occasions. From the moment of discovery it was naturally associated with the famous Demetrius. Indeed, it became the primary source for all discussions of his early political career—every study

Griechischen Historiker (Leiden: Brill 1954) 328 F65 and Cicero *de Legibus* 2.64–66; for attacks on his personal life Athenaios 12.542B–C, E–F, 13.593E–F and D.L. 5.76.

¹¹ Plutarch *Mor.* 820E.

¹² It is also quite probable that our sources have at times confused reports about our Demetrius with those about Demetrius Poliorketes. See M. Sollenberger's account of Diogenes Laertios' life of Demetrius of Phalerum in the present collection.

of Demetrius relies on it¹³—and the linchpin underlying the depiction of Demetrius during his years of political power in Athens as the man on the horse, the military dictator. But this inscription, it can now be shown, has nothing to do with the famous Demetrius because it belongs to the mid-third century B.C.¹⁴

The lettering on this base is the work of the Cutter of *IG II² 788*.¹⁵ This man's inscribing career extended from about the year 270 to about the year 235 B.C. Moreover, since the general on the base was honored by the garrisons at Eleusis, Panakton, and Phyle, he must be the general over the Eleusinian territory;¹⁶ this generalship did not exist at the time of the Elder Demetrius, i.e. *ca.* 314. At the time of the *Athenaion Politeia* and down to at least the year 290 B.C., there was just one general over the entire Attic countryside with the title *strategos ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν*.¹⁷ Not later than the year 265, this single office was divided into a general for the coastal region (*ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν παραλίαν*)¹⁸ and another for the Eleusinian district, which included Panakton and Phyle (*ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπ' Ἐλευσίνος*).¹⁹ Therefore, the statue base from Eleusis can date no earlier than the year 270 B.C. It can not refer to the famous Demetrius, but must refer to his grandson of the same name, who was the agent of Antigonos Gonatas in Athens about the year 260 in the aftermath of the Chremonidean War.²⁰

¹³ See, for example, the account in J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1971) no. 3455.

¹⁴ See S. V. Tracy, "Hands in Greek Epigraphy - Demetrius of Phalerum," in *Boeotia Antiqua IV*, ed. J. M. Fossey (Amsterdam 1994) 151–61, for a brief initial presentation of this discovery and some of its ramifications.

¹⁵ Tracy 1995, 171–74.

¹⁶ The earliest occurrence of mention of the garrison at Eleusis as a separate entity is *IG II² 1272* of 267/6. The three garrisons together occur in *IG II² 1299* (236/5), 1303 (218/7), 1304 (211/0), and 1305, 1306, and 1307, all of the late third century B.C.

¹⁷ *Ath. Pol.* 61; O. W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* (Leiden: Brill 1971) no. 15 lines 2–3 (l. side) of probably 329/8; *IG II² 2847* of *fin. s. IV a.*, and 682 line 24 of *ca.* 290.

¹⁸ See *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 24 no. 154 of the year of Peithidemos (268/7?—for the year *Hesperia* 57 [1988] 309), *IG II² 2854* of *ca.* 258, and *IG II² 2856* and J. Pouilloux, *La Forteresse de Rhamnonte* (Paris: E. De Boccard 1954) 118–20 no. 7, both of *ca.* 250.

¹⁹ *IG II² 3460* of the year of Antimachos, who is known from a recently discovered inscription (as yet unpublished) to have been archon soon after the Chremonidean war, and 1287 of *ca.* 250.

²⁰ Obscurely known, his patronymic came to light only in 1978 (*Hesperia* 47 [1978]

In 1969 another base of an equestrian statue of Demetrius, Epigraphical Museum inv. no. 13379, was published with an inadequate photograph in *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*.²¹ Only in June of this year (1995) was I able to travel to Athens to examine the inscription on this base. While it is not possible to date the lettering with certainty, it is not *stoichedon* and, despite its height, a centimeter and a half high, it is lightly inscribed. The workmanship is not of the best quality. Double cutting is very evident and the strokes are not made with precision. This lettering is probably the work of a local cutter who hailed from where the base was found, namely in the deme of Sphettos which is located east of Mt. Hymettos in the mesogaia. Although it could be work of the last quarter of the fourth century, I judge it more likely that this particular lettering dates to the third century.²² I suspect this base too was for a statue of Demetrius the Younger. Thus, there is as yet no certain surviving base of a statue of Demetrius the Elder.

And once *IG II² 2971*, the statue base from Eleusis, has been removed from the dossier of evidence applicable to him, we possess no reliable evidence that our Demetrius ever held a generalship or had an active military career. I hardly need add that the fact that he wrote a work in two books entitled Στρατηγικῶν constitutes no proof that he had any practical experience as a leader of men in warfare.²³ Indeed, when the son of Antigonos attacked Athens in the spring of the year 307, Demetrius of Phalerum withdrew before the major military engagement, the assault on the garrison in Mounychia, took place. He satisfied himself to negotiate on behalf of the city and received a safe-conduct to Thebes.²⁴ The lone report of Polyainos²⁵ that describes Demetrius at this

281). Ferguson 1974, 183 surmised that he was the man appointed by Antigonos Gonatas as *thesmothetes* (Athenaios 4.167F) and Habicht (*Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit, Hypomnemata* 73 [Göttingen 1982] 18–20, 54) argued that this was a special multi-year appointment. For more on his career, see Tracy 1994, 156–57.

²¹ 93 (1969) 56–71.

²² There are no good parallels for this lettering in J. Kirchner, *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum*, 2nd ed., ed. by G. Klaffenbach (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag 1948). The lettering, for example, is not as fine as that of *IG II² 3835* (Kirchner-Klaffenbach no. 72) of the late fourth century; it is fairly close in style to the lettering of plate IX.2 in J. Marcadé, *Recueil des signatures de sculpteurs grecs I* (Paris: E. De Boccard 1953) of the first half of the third century B.C. But caution is needed for this latter may be the work of a Delphian cutter even though the base is signed by an Athenian artist.

²³ For the list of his works see D.L. 5.80.

²⁴ Diodoros 20.45.3, Plutarch *Demetrius* 8–10, Dion. Halik. *Din.* 2–3.

²⁵ 4.7.6.

time as “leading the Athenians as general” (Ἀθηναίων στρατηγῶν) appears to be based on inference from the situation rather than on any solid evidence.

Demetrius’ supposed military career, moreover, has prevented scholars from seeing the real terms imposed by Kassander on the Athenians in the year 317. He created two poles of power, one in Athens, one in the Piraeus, each with different missions. He granted the Athenians a measure of autonomy in their internal affairs by letting them “elect” a distinguished fellow citizen, namely Demetrius of Phalerum, as overseer (*epimeletes*) of the city.²⁶ At the same time, he retained control by vesting all military power in his commandant stationed in Piraeus. This practice of creating a civil authority separate and distinct from the military was one that Alexander the Great had used to good effect in his recent campaigns in the East, particularly Asia Minor.²⁷ Demetrius was the civilian leader; he had no jurisdiction whatever over the military. There is thus not only no evidence supporting the picture of him as the man on the horse, but Kassander’s settlement, properly understood, was always positive evidence against it.

Was Demetrius’ rule anti-democratic? Scholars have asserted that it was. Demetrius was elected in the year 317, at Kassander’s behest, to an extraordinary office of overseer (*epimeletes*) for a year; it was in this capacity that he revised the laws of the city.²⁸ This was not unconstitutional at Athens—it was rather like the appointment of a special prosecutor in our own day. Indeed, as a student of Theophrastos, Demetrius was ideally suited to revising the law code.²⁹ Once this task was completed, though he was Kassander’s acknowledged spokesman, he probably had no official position. He held, so far as we know, only one other office for the remainder of his so-called period of control—he was archon eponymous, the chief magistrate, chosen by lot, in the year 309/8.³⁰ These actions not only point to the retention of the democratic ma-

²⁶ Diodoros 18.74.3.

²⁷ W. W. Tarn, *The Cambridge Ancient History* VI (New York: MacMillan 1927) 370 and A. B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1988) 229–38.

²⁸ Diodoros 18.74.3; *IG* II² 1201 lines 11–12.

²⁹ Hard evidence bearing on the exact nature of his lawgiving is very sparse. See Michael Gagarin’s discussion of this whole matter in the present collection. For an earlier point of view, see the influential article by St. Dow and A. H. Travis, “Demetrius of Phalerum and His Lawgiving,” *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 144–65.

³⁰ *Mar. Parium* B line 24.

chinery of government, but even suggest some scruple with regard to the traditional archonships.

Scholars in the past have also claimed that Demetrius ended sortition and limited drastically the activities of the assembly. If that were the case, it would be more than enough to conclude that he was an enemy of the democracy. But the four decrees adduced as evidence that allotting of offices had been abandoned in Demetrius' time show nothing of the kind because studies by various scholars over the last 90 years have shown that not one of them dates to the time when Demetrius was in control.³¹ The assumption that the assembly and the council did not meet was based on the fact that we have almost no inscriptions from the time. But is that assumption a good, that is, a necessary one? No, it is not. We can postulate with equal probability that the assembly met regularly and that all that Demetrius did, as part of his well-attested measures to get the Athenian economy back in shape, was to curtail sharply the money available to pay for the inscribing of inscriptions.³²

The two decrees of the assembly that can with certainty be dated to his period of control, *IG* II² 450 and 453, reveal no unusual irregularities—one dates to the year 313, the other to 309; indeed, and very significantly, the chairman of the meeting and his fellow chairmen appear in the respective preambles of these decrees in their usual place. They were allotted by a subcommittee of the council (*boule*) in preparation for the meeting. The wording of these two decrees, in short, gives every reason to think that the assembly and council were meeting regularly.

What else do we learn about Demetrius and Athenian government at this time? We know that he lessened the means qualification necessary to participate as a citizen from 2000 to 1000 drachmas, i.e. that he actually expanded the citizen pool and opened up the process to more

³¹ *IG* II² 452 [328/7], 670 I, II [ca. 265], 454 [324/3] (Sundwall, *De Institutis Reipublicae Atheniensium post Aristotelis Aetatem Commutatis*, Acta Soc. Scient. Fennicae 34 [1907] 11–12).

³² It would be a mistake to underestimate the losses of men and matériel incurred as a result of the Lamian War. The fleet which had numbered 392 triremes in 330/29 (*IG* II² 1627 line 269) was largely destroyed in the spring and summer of 322. Significant numbers of casualties also occurred both on land and sea. These losses to the Athenians must have been enormous and cannot have been easily made up in a few years. Demetrius, in short, inherited in the year 317 a city that had serious economic problems. While we are not in a position to reconstruct his policies to deal with these problems, it is no accident that many of his known actions deal with expenditures of money.

people, at least two to three times as many as the oligarchic regime which preceded him.³³ Moreover, the law courts, one of the most important vehicles for the people to exercise their sovereignty, were active. Indeed, Demetrius is reported to have increased the size of juries in impeachment (*eisangelia*) cases.³⁴ These are not the acts of an anti-democratic tyrant. His claims to have strengthened the democracy were not, in my judgment, empty rhetoric.

Where Athenian freedom of action was sharply limited was in foreign policy and military matters and this is, of course, in stark contrast to the fifth century. After the year 322, that is, after their defeat in the Lamian War, the harsh fact is that the Athenians had neither an army nor a navy of any note. The Macedonian commander in Piraeus had the final say concerning all military decisions. Nevertheless, the Macedonian military presence was not so onerous as to prevent some Athenians during the year 313 from trying to aid King Antigonos, Kassander's enemy.³⁵ I think it fair to say that the Athenians at the time of Demetrius practiced democracy, had control of their internal affairs, and at least some even dared to meddle in foreign affairs.

But one might well object "What was Demetrius' precise role and is it not a sham to claim that the democratic institutions were functioning if in the end they had no real power, if in fact that power was invested in Demetrius?" Or it could be argued that of course he maintained the outward show of democracy but that in fact like some modern "peoples' democratic republics" his regime was very repressive. Was Demetrius, in short, a Quisling, a stooge of the Macedonians, who kept his fellow citizens subservient to the controlling power? No doubt the presence of the Macedonian garrison could have enabled him to play the tyrant. But, did he? I think not.

In at least one instance, and it is (I submit) a very significant one, he can be shown to have opposed the Macedonians on a matter related to military affairs. *IG II² 1187*, an inscription from the deme of Eleusis of the year 319/8, a year and a half roughly before Demetrius came to power, praises a prominent citizen who was general over the countryside for educating the young men of Eleusis. It has been cogently argued

³³ Diodoros 18.74.3.

³⁴ Pollux 8.53.

³⁵ Diodoros (19.78.4) reports that the Athenians at first in secret (λάθρᾳ) kept importuning King Antigonos to set them free and then, on the approach of Antigonos' general Ptolemaios, forced Demetrius to send envoys to the King about an alliance.

that he did this on the local level because the two-year course of military training for Athenian youths, known as the *ephebeia*, was no longer available to these young men.³⁶ It appears then that after the Athenian defeat in the Lamian War at the battle of Krannon in early August of 322, i.e. some five years before Demetrius came into the limelight, the victorious Macedonians had abolished military training for the young men of Athens. At some point under Demetrius this training was reinstated for we know of an ephebe (this is what an Athenian cadet was called) of the year 312³⁷ and probably also of a military instructor of the year 314/3.³⁸ Demetrius clearly took the initiative to do this and persuaded the Macedonians to acquiesce by agreeing to reduce the duration of the training from two years to one. His purpose must have been to create at least a small pool of citizens with some military preparedness. Surely we should credit him with taking an independent line here, one that placed the good of his city above the wishes of the Macedonians.

In short, the evidence, sparse though it is, suggests that Demetrius did not act illegally, that he did oppose the Macedonians from time-to-time, that he respected the traditional offices of the democracy, and that his fellow citizens enjoyed full powers in their domestic affairs. Whatever power he exercised (apart from the two official posts he held) was informal and accrued to him not just because he was Kassander's chosen representative, but also because of his recognized standing as a statesman, lawgiver, and diplomat. As the highly complimentary deme decree *IG II² 1201* in his honor attests, his contemporaries, many of them, clearly valued him.

As a public figure, Demetrius was primarily a diplomat and a lawgiver. In his private capacity, he was also a prominent student of philosophy and a very productive scholar/writer. Indeed, Diogenes Laertios describes him as nearly the most prolific of the Peripatetics.³⁹ As a further indication of his standing in the Peripatos, Diogenes appends Demetrius' life to the lives of the first four scholarchs, even though Demetrius was never head of the school.⁴⁰ There can be no

³⁶Fordyce Mitchel, "Derkylos of Hagnous and the Date of I.G., II², 1187," *Hesperia* 33 (1964) 346–48.

³⁷*IG II² 2323a* lines 46–47.

³⁸J. D. Morgan will argue in his forthcoming study of the Athenian calendar and the archon list that *IG II² 585*, a fragmentary decree in honor of a cadet instructor (*paidotribes*), belongs to this year.

³⁹DL. 5.80–81 where he also gives the titles of his works.

doubt then that Demetrius deserves to be taken very seriously as a philosopher and writer.⁴¹

Theophrastos, his teacher, had taken over as head of the Peripatos in 322 and with the help of Demetrius acquired his own garden, i.e. a place for his students to gather for discussions.⁴² Most probably Demetrius shepherded through the assembly a grant of *enktesis* on his behalf, for, as a metic, Theophrastos could not have acquired property without such a grant.⁴³ Be that as it may, Theophrastos remained in Athens under Demetrius and doubtless was available to his former student as an adviser, particularly on the lawcode. At what stage his massive work on the laws, his *Nomoi*, was at this time is unclear. It appears that he composed it either soon after taking over as head of the Peripatos or in the first years of Demetrius' rule, i.e. almost at the same time that Demetrius established his own laws.⁴⁴ In any case, Theophrastos was able to give ample advice on the subject.⁴⁵ Clearly, moreover, he and Demetrius were on good terms. Another of Demetrius' friends during this period was the comic poet Menander, the best playwright of the day. In fact, Menander probably staged the *Dyskolos* during the year 317/6, Demetrius' first year at the helm.⁴⁶ The evidence suggests that during his ten-year regency the Athenians very probably had in Demetrius a leader whose primary aspiration was to be their philosopher-king.

⁴⁰ On this point, see M. G. Sollenberger, "The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' 'Vitae philosophorum' Book 5," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 36.6 (Berlin: de Gruyter 1992) 3798–800.

⁴¹ For an assessment of Demetrius' writings, see section II of Hans Gottschalk's article in this volume.

⁴² D.L. 5.39.

⁴³ On the privilege of *enktesis*, A. Harrison, *The Law of Athens, I: The Family and Property* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1968) 236–38.

⁴⁴ The *Marmor Parium* (B line 16) records that "Demetrius established laws at Athens" when Demogenes was archon (317/6).

⁴⁵ The *Nomoi* is 589 no. 17 FHS&G. See further A. Szegedy-Maszak, *The "Nomoi" of Theophrastus* (New York: Arno Press 1981), who discusses the date on pages 79 to 81 and explicitly characterizes Theophrastos' work on page 86 as "an encyclopedia for legislators, which could be consulted to insure that a prospective law was the best one available."

⁴⁶ E. W. Handley, *The Dyskolos of Menander* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press 1965) 7; A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1973) 128–29.

Not surprisingly, given his scholarly and literary accomplishments, we also find him taking a keen interest in state sponsored literary productions. Almost certainly he reformed public performances of plays and it has been inferred that he probably also did the same for the Homeric epics. The dramas of the three great tragedians, Aischylos, Sophokles, and Euripides, and the epics of Homer were, after all, the most important texts in the cultural heritage of the Athenians; the Homeric texts had been safeguarded, one might more accurately say “appropriated,” for the city of Athens during the sixth century B.C. by no less a figure than Peisistratos and quite recently—about two decades earlier—Lykourgos had seen to the creation of state copies of the plays of the three great tragedians.⁴⁷

Demetrius, it appears, sought to emulate the example of his illustrious predecessors. He concerned himself in particular with the effective presentation of these fundamentally important texts to the Athenian public. By abolishing the liturgy known as the *choregia* and substituting pay for the chorus, he made dramatic performances fully professional.⁴⁸ This change had far-reaching positive effects for it hastened the creation of the guilds of Dionysiac artists at Athens and elsewhere. These became influential associations of professional actors who performed Athenian dramas all over the Greek-speaking world during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. And, on the basis of the report of Athenaios that “Demetrius of Phalerum first introduced those who are now called Homeristai into the theaters,”⁴⁹ Greg Nagy in a recently published book entitled *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*⁵⁰ argues persuasively that Demetrius likewise reformed public performances of Homer in Athens and played a crucial role in the creation and dissemination of the so-called *koine* text of Homer. This text, really the Athenian city text, was fundamental to the work of the Alexandrian editors of Homer. Demetrius’ serious interest in Homer is also revealed by the fact that he

⁴⁷ [Plutarch] *Vit. X Orat.* 841F.

⁴⁸ The last attested choregic monuments, *IG II²* 3055 and 3056, date to 320/19; the first recorded *agonothetes* is Xenokles of Sphettos (Davies 1971, no. 11234) in 307/6 (*IG II²* 3073). See on this point A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1968) 91–92 and R. Blum, *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, trans. by H. H. Wellisch (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press 1991) 24.

⁴⁹ 14.620B.

⁵⁰ Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1995.

wrote a work in two books on the *Iliad* and another in four on the *Odyssey*.⁵¹

For a just appreciation of him, it is also meaningful to note that Demetrius retained his standing following his ouster from Athens. He was not disgraced or apparently even discredited for long. Although Cicero reports that he went to Alexandria soon after 307,⁵² it seems more likely that he chose to remain in nearby Thebes hoping for reinstatement by Kassander.⁵³ Most probably then his sojourn in Alexandria is to be placed after Kassander's death in 297.⁵⁴ Be that as it may, he played an important part in the intellectual life of that city. Indeed, it appears that the first Ptolemy took him as an adviser when he could not secure the services of Theophrastos, the head of the Peripatos.⁵⁵ He advised the king on the lawcode⁵⁶ and on his plans for what was to become the great library.⁵⁷

His influence on later letters may in fact have been far more profound than is usually suspected and than I have thus far suggested. (I am aware that I am entering onto very slippery ground, but proceed anyway.) The account in the letter of Aristeeas that made Demetrius head of the library charged with collecting all the books in the world, even with translating books from the Hebrew,⁵⁸ is certainly late—ca. 100 B.C.—and fundamentally wrong on some important points.⁵⁹ To take but the most obvious—however much the first Ptolemy may have laid the groundwork for it, the library as an actual institution did not apparently come into being until the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphos. By then Demetrius was out of favor at court; he could not, therefore, have been

⁵¹ D.L. 5.81.

⁵² *De Fin.* 5.19.53.

⁵³ Ch. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1985) 77–82, has shown that an inscribed lead tablet which names Demetrius along with Kassander and his brother Pleistarchos belongs to the year 304 when Kassander was besieging Athens. This suggests that the writer of the tablet believed Demetrius to be close by at the time, i.e. in neighboring Thebes not in distant Alexandria.

⁵⁴ D.L. 5.78.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 37.

⁵⁶ Aelian V.H. 3.17; see also P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1972) 114–15.

⁵⁷ Plutarch *Moralia* 189D; Fraser 1972, 314–15, 690.

⁵⁸ The letter of Aristeeas to Philokrates (Jacoby 1954, 228 T6e).

⁵⁹ Beginning with this sentence most of this paragraph and the next have been taken with slight alterations from my *Athenian Democracy in Transition* (above, n. 1) 50–51.

head of the library. Surely, however, Demetrius was active in some way in the efforts of the first Ptolemy to create a collection. The letter could well, therefore, preserve in exaggerated form a real memory of Demetrius' activities. He no doubt put together at least part of the collection that later became the great library.⁶⁰ And he certainly saw to it that his own books and his own scholarly work found a place in the new collection. More importantly, it is *prima facie* extremely probable that he acquired *ca.* 295 B.C. or earlier copies of many of the works of Aristotle and Theophrastos. As a distinguished member of the Peripatos, he was unusually well-positioned to do exactly this.

If this is correct (and it must remain an hypothesis), the early history of Aristotle's works must be seen in a different light than heretofore. Previous discussion has tended to focus on the activities of one Neleus of Skepsis to whom Theophrastos left all his books at his death *ca.* 287 B.C.⁶¹ It is reported, I assume correctly, that the books of Aristotle were among Theophrastos' books.⁶² The ancient sources preserve two conflicting accounts about Neleus' handling of his legacy. One was that he took the books to Skepsis where after his death they lay moldering in a cellar until Apellikon of Teos brought them back to Athens early in the first century B.C.⁶³ The other was that he sold them to Ptolemy II Philadelphos for the library at Alexandria.⁶⁴ Whatever Neleus' exact role was,⁶⁵ it is significantly diminished in importance if we believe that, thanks to the activities of Demetrius of Phalerum, copies of many of the major Aristotelian treatises were already in Alexandria before the death of Theophrastos.⁶⁶ They were thus well-known in the Hellenistic period

⁶⁰ Fraser 1972, 314–15.

⁶¹ D.L. 5.52. Theophrastos died either in the year 288/7 or 287/6.

⁶² The report occurs in Athenaios 1.3A–B and in Strabo 13.1.54. The will of Aristotle preserved in Diogenes Laertios (5.11–17) makes no provision for his books. There are two possible reasons: either the will is incomplete or the books had already been entrusted to Theophrastos.

⁶³ Strabo 13.1.54, Plutarch *Sulla* 26.1–2.

⁶⁴ Athenaios 1.3A–B.

⁶⁵ On Neleus' activities, see H. B. Gottschalk, "Notes on the Wills of the Peripatetic Scholarchs," *Hermes* 100 (1972) 335–42 and C. Lord, "On the Early History of the Aristotelian Corpus," *AJP* 107 (1986) 137–61, esp. 138–45.

⁶⁶ Indeed, their presence may have acted as a catalyst to spur the agents of Ptolemy II to assemble in the library at Alexandria as complete a collection as possible of the works of Aristotle. Neleus may indeed have been approached by them and sold to them much of what he had. Thus it is quite possible that the very efforts of Demetrius to preserve the writings of his great master and his school brought it about that they

and some of them formed the basis for the work of the scholars of the library.

In conclusion, Demetrius surely deserves a better press than he has received—first, for his enlightened rule of Athens where he accomplished much that was positive and did the best he could for his fellow citizens in the difficult circumstances he faced; second, for his very important scholarly contributions, particularly his efforts to further, as well as preserve, the work of the Peripatos; finally, for his creation of the collection that formed the basis of the library at Alexandria. Alas, the bad luck that dogged him and thwarted a proper appreciation of his efforts in Athens continued in Alexandria. He became involved, probably he could not avoid it, in the machinations surrounding the succession to the throne of Egypt. He backed Ptolemy Keraunos, the son of Eurydike, Ptolemy's first wife and sister of his political mentor Kassander. When the future Ptolemy II Philadelphos, the son of Berenike, Ptolemy's second wife, emerged as the favorite around the year 285, Demetrius was soon disgraced, driven out of court, and died under mysterious circumstances. He was bitten, it is reported, by an asp.⁶⁷ In contrast to Demetrius Poliorketes and King Antigonos, who in the year 307/6 had been satisfied with a program of outrageous slander against Demetrius, the second Ptolemy appears to have been sufficiently angered by Demetrius' opposition to his succession that he ordered, to indulge an anachronism, systematic *damnatio memoriae*. We are in consequence forced to reconstruct Demetrius' role from late and derivative sources, such as the letter of Aristeas. Thus, though Demetrius was in truth *de facto* first head of the library and extremely influential in its founding, he never received credit in the official accounts.

were concentrated in the library at the time of the great fire and thus many works, including his own, were lost to posterity.

⁶⁷ D.L. 5.78, *Suda* Δ no. 429, Cicero *Rab. Post.* 9.23.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

4

The Legislation of Demetrius of Phalerum and the Transformation of Athenian Law

Michael Gagarin

It is a curious irony that Athenian law, which is so well documented during the century from ca. 420–320 BC, becomes virtually invisible in the Hellenistic period. In his invaluable collection of the evidence for the Athenian courts, however, Boegehold gives a fair assessment of the evidence for legal procedure after 322, which, though not abundant, shows that the courts continued to sit and to use the same sort of equipment in the third century and later.¹ Clearly, law and the courts did not simply disappear. Even if political figures no longer used the courts to advance their careers, litigation regarding family matters, economic affairs and criminal activity, to name just a few areas, must have continued; and yet virtually no record of any of this survives.²

¹ See Alan L. Boegehold, *The Lawcourts at Athens: Sites, Buildings, Equipment, Procedure, and Testimonia* (The Athenian Agora, vol. 28; The American School of Classical Studies: Princeton 1995) 41–42 and his testimonia nos. 93, 94, 95, 305, and 318.

² Even William Scott Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens: An Historical Essay* (London 1911) can only muster five references to “laws” in the index, one of which is to Plato’s *Laws*. Of the others, three refer to Demetrius’ legislation and the supposed revision after the end of his rule (for which, see below, n. 11), and the other is a reference to a

The only major figure associated with law and legislation in Athens after 320 is Demetrius of Phalerum, who presided over the city for a pivotal decade (317–307) and seems to have set the course for Athenian law for the next century and more. The aim of this paper is to review what we know of Demetrius' legislation and to assess what effect he and his legislation had on Athenian law and legal procedure during the period of his own rule and thereafter. Since the known facts are few, any conclusions reached about the purpose or effect of Demetrius' legislation must remain to some extent speculative.

1. Demetrius' Legislation: The Direct Evidence

In 317 BC the philosopher and former student of Theophrastus, Demetrius of Phalerum, became in effect the sole ruler of Athens, at least as regards internal affairs.³ His rule resulted from external political and military developments, which I need not review here. Early in his regime he was given the title ἐπιμελητής,⁴ and assumed the authority to write new laws for the city (*IG* II² 1201—see below 1). His economic, legal, and political reforms led to a period of peace and prosperity but at the cost of some of the more democratic features of Athenian public life. Indeed, the remaining democratic politicians in the city never accepted his rule, and in 307 he was replaced by Demetrius Poliorcetes. This change too was brought about primarily by external forces.

Several texts in the collection of Stork, van Ophuijsen and Dorandi supply evidence for Demetrius' legislation. They indicate that he certainly enacted some legislation, but we can only determine the substance of two or three laws, and we have no evidence that the legislation

“revision of the laws” under Eurycleides, a century later, though there is no evidence of large-scale legislation at this time. See *IG* II² 834 (= *IG* II 379).

³ Stephen V. Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition: Attic Letter-cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1995) 36–51, and Christian Habicht, *Athen: Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit* (Munich: C. H. Beck 1995) 62–75 [= *Athens from Alexander to Anthony* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1997) 53–66] provide the most recent surveys of Demetrius' rule. Habicht includes more discussion of Demetrius' motives and the political context of his reforms, but not all of his conclusions are persuasive.

⁴ S. Dow and A. H. Travis, “Demetrios of Phaleron and his Lawgiving,” *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 144–65 mounted a case for restoring the title νομοθέτης in *IG* II² 1201, line 11. Their restoration is accepted by Phillip Harding, *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus* (Translated Documents of Greece and Rome 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1985) no. 129, pp. 163–64; but see Tracy 1995, 43–46.

was comprehensive. In the section of his Life describing the decade of Demetrius' rule in Athens (5.75–85) Diogenes Laertius says nothing about laws or legislation. Diogenes does give titles of Demetrius' works, four of which (out of 45)⁵ appear to be concerned with legislation—*Peri tās Athēnesi Nomothesias* (5 books), *Peri tōn Athēnesi politeiōn* (2 books), *Hyper tēs politeias*, and *Peri nomōn*—but it is not clear whether in these Demetrius described his own laws or, like Theophrastus in his *Nomoi*, treated the laws of Athens and other cities largely without reference to his legislation.

The following texts either mention laws or legislation explicitly, or implicitly suggest features of Demetrius' legislation.

(1) **16B** SOD = 12 W: *IG* II² 1201, dated to 317/6, honoring Demetrius reads in part, ἐπιμελητῆς αἰ]ρεθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμο[υ τοῦ Ἀθηναίων νόμους] ἔθ[η]κεν καλ[οὺς καὶ συμφέροντας τῇ πόλει]· ὕστερον [δέ . . .⁶ (“having been elected overseer by the people of Athens, he enacted laws which are fine and beneficial to the city; and later . . .”).

(2) **20A** = 15 W: The Parian Marble (B 13) under 317/6: “Demetrius enacted laws (νόμους ἔθηκεν) for the Athenians.”

(3) **56** = 16 W: Cicero (*De re publica* 2.1.2) speaks of men “who organized their own government, each using his own laws and institutions (*suam quisque rem publicam constituisset legibus atque institutis suis*), among whom he includes the Athenians Theseus, Draco, Solon, Cleisthenes and many others and finally “when it was prostrate and already dying, it was restored by the learned man from Phalerum, Demetrius” (*postremo exsanguem iam et iacentem doctus vir Phalerus sustentasset Demetrius*).

(4) **20B, 58A** = 17 W: Syncellus (an eighth-century Byzantine monk) says that Demetrius “became known as the third lawgiver (τρίτος νομοθέτης) of Athens.”

(5) **52** = 32 W: Pollux (8.102) reports about the Eleven that “in the time of the Phalerean their name was changed to *Nomophylakes*.”

⁵ There is some duplication in these titles (e.g., *Peri nomōn* is listed a second time) and in some cases different titles may designate the same work.

⁶ I give in bold type the number of the new edition (SOD), followed by the number of Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* IV: Demetrios von Phaleron (Basel 1949). The supplements are uncontroversial except for ἐπιμελητῆς, for which see above, n. 4. the stone breaks off after ὕστερον.

(6) **43A–B** = 34 W: Athenaeus (542d), citing (not necessarily quoting) Demetrius' contemporary, the historian Duris, gives a catalogue of Demetrius' vices and concludes that he "who was laying down laws (τιθέμενος θεσμούς) for other people and regulating their lives, organized his own life with utter freedom from the law."

(7) **53** = 135 W: Cicero (*De legibus* 2.64–66) reports that Demetrius wrote that although Solon restrained extravagance in mourning and burial, these later increased to the point that Demetrius himself restrained this practice by law (*lege*), and (Cicero continues) "he limited expenses not just by imposing a penalty (*poena*) but also by setting a time (*tempore*): he ordered (*iussit*) that burials were to take place before the light of day. Moreover, he set a limit to new sepulchers: he did not wish to have anything erected above the mound of earth except a small column, not more than three cubits high, or a table or basin, and he appointed a magistrate specifically to look after this."⁷

(8) **96A** = 141a W: Pollux 8.53: "1,000 judged *eisangeliai* according to Solon; an additional 500 according to (Demetrius) of Phalerum."

96B = 141b W: *Lex Cant.* 337: "those attacking sycophants brought an *eisangelia*, when, as Philochorus says, there were 1,000 (jurors) seated, but Demetrius of Phalerum (says) there were 1,500."

(9) **97** = 144 W: *Lex. Cant.* 350: Demetrius says "some defendants in cases of arbitration use fraudulent means (κακοτεχνεῖν) against the plaintiffs by moving to get the judgment by default declared null and void and thus obtain a rehearing of the case. For those involved in litigation of more than ten drachmas are obliged to get arbitrators for each separate case Some people who have a weak case to defend and are frightened of a judgment against them in the arbitration, cause delays and make excuses such as seem to be reasonable; first they file a *paragraphê* [a counter-suit alleging the case is inadmissible], next they swear affidavits about (their) illness or absence abroad, and finally they do not appear in court on the day appointed for the arbitration; that way they can get the judgment by default declared null and void for the party who had got the conviction and thus obtain a rehearing of the case, with the result that they would be back at their starting point with the litigation undecided."

⁷ On the details of these restrictions, see most recently Rudolf H. W. Stichel, "Columnella—Mensa—Labellum: Zur Form der attischen Grabmäler im Luxusgesetz des Demetrios von Phaleron," *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1992) 433–40.

We learn from these sources that Demetrius enacted legislation (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7), in the first year of his rule (1), concerning the government (3, 5), people's personal lives (6) and in particular burial practices (7), and apparently enacted some procedural reforms (5, 8, 9). It is not clear whether these last three items refer to actual legislation, but the change of name (5) may suggest new duties (but see below), the report in 8 implies that Demetrius raised the number of jurors from 1,000 to 1,500 in an *eisangelia*, and the description of legal abuses in 9 may have been intended to explain or justify Demetrius' own, reforming legislation. Other texts⁸ concerning Demetrius' writings about law and government appear to be purely descriptive and probably had no direct connection with his own legislation.⁹

The meagerness of this evidence for Demetrius' legislation has inspired some scholars to look elsewhere for clues to Demetrius' legislative activity. Most notably, William Scott Ferguson undertook to fill many of the gaps in our picture of Demetrius' legislation, devoting a 12-page paper¹⁰ and much of his more than fifty-page chapter on Demetrius (above, n. 2, 38–94) to his legal reforms. Ferguson was convinced that Demetrius enacted an entirely new set of laws for Athens,¹¹ and he paints a full and colorful picture, explaining not only what laws

⁸ 1, 13B, 19, 89, 95, 98–101, 110, 115–17, 156, 164 = 131–4, 136–40, 143, 145–8 W.

⁹ It is possible, however, that Demetrius' complaints about high expenditures on the production of dramas or public works (110, 115 = 137, 136 W) was intended to justify his own reforms of these practices.

¹⁰ William Scott Ferguson, "The Laws of Demetrius of Phalerum and their Guardians," *Klio* 11 (1911) 265–76.

¹¹ "The entire code was promulgated in 316/5," according to Ferguson (above, n. 2) 43. Ferguson's date stems from his assessment of ὅροι or boundary stones (above, n. 10, 265–67), which has been refuted by Moses I. Finley, *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500–200 B.C.* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press 1952), esp. 177–81 (see further below). Ferguson supports his idea that Demetrius enacted a code of laws by misremembering (?) a passage in Polybius (12.13.9–12) that discusses Demochares, a political opponent of Demetrius. Ferguson (above, n. 2) 103 translates a direct quotation of Polybius' report of Demochares' criticisms of Demetrius, and the translation is reasonably accurate until the last two sentences. These read, "And a fine set of laws this blondined Solon had drawn up. Let them be revised at once." From these two sentences, which contain the only mention of laws in the whole passage, Ferguson concludes both that Demetrius promulgated a law code and also that right after he was removed from power, "a revision of the law code was, accordingly, begun." The conclusion might be acceptable, except for the fact that these last two sentences correspond to nothing in the Greek text, either in this section or anywhere else in Polybius, as far as I can determine. The case for Demetrius' law code (and its repeal) thus appears to be a figment of Ferguson's imagination.

Demetrius enacted but why. In speaking of laws governing contracts and wills, for instance, he tells us that "the purpose of Demetrius in making these changes is obvious. It was to protect the Athenian men of means, whose welfare he made it the avowed purpose of all his legislation to promote, in investing their money in Athenian real estate" (above, n. 10, 268).

Ferguson's reconstruction may appear plausible at first, and some later scholars¹² have accepted and even expanded it; but on closer examination it cannot be sustained. One of Ferguson's methods is to find a practice or a rule supposedly in effect after Demetrius' time for which there is no good evidence before Demetrius and then conclude that he enacted legislation on the matter. I need not demonstrate the weaknesses of this method in detail, since Finley, in his Columbia dissertation, showed the fallacies in Ferguson's reconstruction of Demetrius' laws on sale and gifts, and Gehrke has done much the same for several other points.¹³ What we are left with in terms of actual legislation is not much. I leave aside constitutional and administrative reforms, such as the change in financial requirements for political participation and the reform of certain administrative bodies, since these probably were effected by means other than legislation; similarly, the abolition of liturgies did not necessarily require the enactment of any laws.¹⁴

For legislation in the strict sense we have only the testimonia assembled above. These indicate a general concern with sumptuary legislation, but only in the case of funerals and funerary monuments do we have good evidence for specific changes. In addition, it seems likely that Demetrius created or more likely reconstituted, perhaps by means of legislation, the boards of *Gynaikonomoi* to oversee women's activities and *Nomophylakes* to oversee religious and political activity. And that's about it. It has been claimed that along with his constitutional reforms Demetrius made changes in legal procedure, but as Gehrke concludes, "We have no information that Demetrius radically reduced the activity and competence of the popular courts" (1978, 154). Although "radically" may beg the question, Gehrke is essentially correct to see

¹² E.g., Dow and Travis (above, n. 4).

¹³ Finley (above, n. 11); Hans-Joachim Gehrke, "Das Verhältnis von Politik und Philosophie im Wirken des Demetrios von Phaleron," *Chiron* 8 (1978) 149–93.

¹⁴ See also Robert W. Wallace, *The Areopagus Council to 307 B.C.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1989) 204–6, for Demetrius' reforms that affected the Areopagus.

Demetrius' reforms of legal procedure as minor. Even if, for example, Demetrius raised the number of jurors required to decide an *eisangelia* from 1000 to 1500, this in itself would not have significantly altered the use of this procedure. If the use of *eisangelia* did decline—and the evidence suggests that it did—this was probably the result of political changes not legal reform. Similarly, although raising the financial requirement for citizenship may have altered the composition of the jury, there is no evidence that jury-pay was abolished (though many scholars assume it was),¹⁵ and the composition of the jury and the process by which it reached a verdict probably remained essentially the same.

Similarly, the *Nomophylakes* supplemented the activity of the courts, and may have rendered some of the litigation against the public activities of citizens unnecessary, but the structure and prerogatives of the courts, and the rules governing the judicial process, appear to have remained essentially the same. It is generally assumed, even by Gehrke (above, n. 12, 154), that Demetrius set aside the *graphē paranomōn*, since the duty of objecting to undesirable new laws was now in the hands of the *Nomophylakes*. But even if it is true that individuals no longer brought suits under the *graphē paranomōn*, the law itself may have remained in effect, for it was used in 306 by Philo, as Diogenes tells us (5.38), in his successful prosecution of Sophocles for his law banning the philosophers from Athens.¹⁶ Moreover, the *Nomophylakes* were probably established several years before Demetrius, and we have no evidence that their duties were substantially different in his time.¹⁷

Thus, although Demetrius must have enacted some laws, it seems clear that he did not engage in full-scale legislation on the model of Solon. His reputation was probably based on his political and constitutional reforms more than his legal reforms, and these could have been spoken of as changes in *nomoi*, even if they did not involve legislation. Cicero's phrase is perhaps more accurate, when he speaks of men orga-

¹⁵ See James M. Williams, "The Peripatetic School and Demetrius of Phaleron's Reforms in Athens," *Ancient World* 15 (1987) 87–98, at 95 n. 26.

¹⁶ It is possible that the *graphē paranomōn* was abolished by Demetrius and then restored immediately after he left office; but if so, the restoration would be a noteworthy event, especially in connection with the prosecution of Sophocles that followed soon after, and we might expect Diogenes to mention it.

¹⁷ Wallace (above, n. 14, 202–3) is inclined to date the change "shortly after 322." The report in Pollux (5) that the Eleven were renamed *Nomophylakes* "in the time of the Phalerean" does not provide strong evidence against Wallace's conclusion.

nizing their states *legibus atque institutis*. It is also significant that Cicero includes among the great reformers of Athens Theseus and Cleisthenes, neither of whom is traditionally associated with large-scale legislation, as Draco and Solon are. Even Demetrius' constitutional changes were perhaps not as far-reaching as some later writers seem to think. His franchise requirement of 1,000 drachmas, for instance, was only half as large as that imposed briefly by Phocion five years earlier. The requirement is not insignificant, but it seems doubtful that it would have led to such a substantial difference in the composition of jurors as to change the legal process.

2. Peripatetic Influence on Demetrius' Legislation

Whatever one's ultimate assessment of his rule, Demetrius exemplifies the rare combination of intellectual and statesman who is successful in both spheres. As a result, the relation between his legislation and the views on law and legislation expressed by him and others with whom he associated has long interested scholars, who have devoted much attention to finding connections between these two aspects of Demetrius' accomplishment. Much of Ferguson's *Klio* article on Demetrius' laws (above, n. 10) is devoted to showing the influence of Theophrastus. His method is to quote liberally from the work of the latter (though only once from his *Nomoi*) and then claim that since Demetrius legislated in the same general area, he was influenced by Theophrastus.¹⁸ Gehrke has thoroughly examined and rejected most of Ferguson's conclusions, showing that most of the measures attributed to Demetrius are attested in Greece at the time of Demetrius or earlier, so that it is unnecessary to posit any direct philosophical influence. Demetrius was motivated by practical rather than philosophical concerns, Gehrke argues; his reforms

¹⁸ Consider, e.g., Ferguson's first point (above, n. 10) 268–69: he cites 57 = fr. 72 W (= Cicero *De Leg.* 3.14) to the effect that "Demetrius, a student of Theophrastus, brought learning out of the shady abodes . . . of the erudite . . . into the very battle line of strife," from which he concludes that Theophrastus' influence was "far-reaching and potent." He then cites a passage, probably from *Peri methēs* (579A FHS&G; see Andrew Szegedy-Maszak, *The Nomoi of Theophrastus* [Arno Press 1981] 89), where Theophrastus reports a Massilian law that women should drink water, not wine and concludes, "the author of the well-known legislation on the public and private behavior of women . . . need not have gone back to Aristotle's *Politics* to find a justification for coercing the suffragettes of his city. A policy such as his was impressed upon the ideal lawgiver in the treatise of Theophrastus" (Ferguson, above, n. 10, 269).

were minimal and were primarily aimed at reducing expenses, so that he could later claim to have corrected the democracy.¹⁹

The differences between Ferguson and Gehrke are partly a matter of how strictly one defines philosophical influence. Ferguson is looking for any connection, however loose, between theory and practice whereas Gehrke's criterion is direct influence amounting almost to causation—"a logical unity (*ein logische Einheit*)," of theory and practice. But even if we accept a broad sense of "influence," Gehrke's minimalist and (I think) accurate assessment of the evidence for Demetrius' legislation means that on many points where Ferguson finds influence, it is doubtful that Demetrius even legislated.

Aristotle remarks (*Nic. Eth.* 10.9, 1181b6–23) that a legislator should draw from the laws of others but must also apply his intelligence and understanding to the process of selection. Demetrius clearly took this advice to heart. He undoubtedly knew well the philosophers' views of law and government and must have been familiar with the practical and detailed compilations of laws and practices recorded in the 150 or so Aristotelian *Politeiai* and in Theophrastus' *Nomoi* and various other works. He may have drawn on some or all of these sources but there is no indication that he followed any one of them closely.

To be sure, Demetrius' rule was in some sense aristocratic, at least in contrast to the period immediately preceding, and in this respect can be seen to derive from the generally aristocratic (or at least anti-democratic) views of Plato, Aristotle and others. But although measures like his institution of a property requirement for political participation or the abolition of the liturgies were clearly aristocratic, Demetrius seems to have considered himself a preserver of democracy (18 = fr. 26 W), and many of his legal reforms cannot be easily labeled. Take, for example, his sumptuary legislation. Similar legislation was enacted by Solon²⁰ and others throughout Greece,²¹ and may perhaps be best explained as

¹⁹ Williams (above, n. 15) has recently argued for a position somewhat in the middle: although we may not have evidence of specific borrowing, Demetrius' reforms coincide, at least in general, with the criticisms of Athenian democracy made by Plato, Aristotle, and others. Habicht (above, n. 3, 67) seems to approve of Williams' position.

²⁰ Demetrius apparently treated his own and Solon's sumptuary legislation in the same work (no. 7 in sec. 1 above).

²¹ A recent example for Demetrius might have been Lycurgus, who is reported to have enacted legislation "that no woman should travel to Eleusis in a carriage" (Plut. *Mor.* 842a).

an attempt to foster the growth of communal spirit in burial and other rituals through the archaic and classical periods and to lessen the individualism associated with aristocratic competition.²² If this is true Demetrius may have been trying to resist a trend toward withdrawal from public life, especially among the rich, for which we see evidence in other areas, such as comedy.

In sum, Demetrius' reforms and Peripatetic legal and political theory may loosely be classified as "conservative," and both were evidently critical of some, though by no means all, aspects of fourth-century Athenian democracy; however, most of their specific remedies were not unique to the Peripatetics but (as Gehrke points out) could be found in practice in other cities or in earlier Athenian legislation. The evidence suggests that Demetrius' reforms were not aimed at revolutionary change (as in 411 or 404) and did not constitute a large-scale political assault on democracy. Rather he drew ideas from a wide range of writings and practices in order to devise specific legislation for a limited number of problems. In carrying out these reforms he may have evoked the example of Solon,²³ who (we should remember) claimed to have stood between the rich and the poor, giving undue advantage to neither (fr. 5 West).

3. The Transformation of Athenian Law under Demetrius

Scholars who have sought to explain the political tenor of Demetrius' legislation have seldom asked how the legal system actually functioned under Demetrius. We have no extant examples of forensic oratory after 322, but we know that at least one logographer, Dinarchus, continued to write forensic speeches under Demetrius (see below).²⁴ There is evidence that substantive law remained more or less the same in most ar-

²² See most recently Richard Seaford, *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1994) 74–86. Habicht (above, n. 3, 65) sees Demetrius' sumptuary legislation as arising from an aristocratic view that no individual should outdo others of his class. This seems just as implausible as attributing the legislation to democratic ideology.

²³ If Demetrius himself used the archaic term *thesmoi* for his laws rather than *nomoi* (no. 6 in sec. 1 above), this was probably meant to recall the legislation of Draco and Solon, and the same can be said of the tag "third law-giver" (no. 4 in sec. 1 above) if in fact he used or approved of it.

²⁴ See also the evidence in Boegehold (above, n. 1).

eas,²⁵ as did most legal procedure. But it also appears that in practice Athenian law underwent a fundamental transformation. Before examining this transformation, we must briefly review some features of law and forensic oratory that made the Athenian legal system in the classical period one of the most unusual the world has ever known.²⁶

First, the Athenians in the classical period shunned professionalism in law, as they did in government in general. Different magistrates, selected by lot and serving short terms (usually a year), oversaw the conduct of a trial, but they had little authority and did not control or direct the proceedings, as a modern judge would. Statutes designated offenses in ordinary language and no authority established the legal definition of an offense. The nearest thing to a trained professional was the logographer who could write a speech for a litigant and probably give him advice on his case as well, but had no independent authority and played no role in the actual trial. Finally, there was no legal scholarship of the sort we find in Rome and most other societies with developed legal systems. None of the works of Plato, Aristotle, or Theophrastus provides any direct analysis of or guidance in understanding the nature and function of the Athenian legal system, and none of these would help a litigant prepare his case or guide a juror in deciding it.

As a result, the function of a trial in the classical period was not merely, as it is today (at least in theory), to determine objectively whether the facts of the case fit the specific requirements of the relevant statutes. Rather, a trial in Athens was a contest (*agōn*) between two parties, who engaged in verbal dispute before a large number of jurors who, for the most part, were ordinary citizens. A legal *agōn* might draw a crowd of spectators, for the conflicting stories told by the litigants regularly raised issues of interest to the community at large; and in some well-known cases major policy decisions were made or confirmed by jurors in the courts. Even cases with no overt political interest regularly displayed stories of individuals who were also public figures. Sometimes we can see evidence of the political dimension of an apparently non-political case in the speech itself (e.g., Lys. 7); even where there is no clear evidence (as, e.g., Lys. 3) we may suspect that the case forms

²⁵ See Adele Scafuro, *The Forensic Stage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1997) 14–16..

²⁶ The best single work on these features of Athenian law is Stephen Todd, *The Shape of Athenian Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1993).

part of a long-standing dispute that has a political dimension. In short, little effort was made to remove political concerns from the legal system, a fact that troubles most modern scholars but seems to have been taken for granted and even welcomed by the Athenians.

The entanglement of law and politics also meant politically ambitious citizens might bring a legal case in order to advance their own careers,²⁷ and in some cases one can read a whole history of political struggle among various participants of which the case at hand is only the latest step. In this way, as some scholars are now realizing, the legal system may have fostered conflict between individuals as much as it helped resolve conflict.²⁸ Thus, it is not surprising that when the works of the best orators later began to be collected, the list was dominated by public figures, especially after 350. Of course, purely private suits continued to be brought to court and argued by the litigants, some of whom undoubtedly still went to a logographer for a speech or just for advice; but the best speakers, it appears, were more concerned with their own public careers.

After 320, it is clear that the political landscape changed drastically. Although Athens still to a large extent controlled its internal affairs, political prominence was attained by one's allegiance to non-Athenian ruling powers, not by one's performance in the public arena. We would expect that legal practice would change accordingly, and indeed, our evidence, sparse as it is, suggests that although the rules and procedures remained largely the same, litigation had lost its political dimension and therefore its appeal to those with political ambition. All the prominent orators and logographers were dead except for Dinarchus, who (not coincidentally) was the only non-Athenian orator/logographer at the time.

As a metic, and thus unable to participate in litigation himself, Dinarchus continued to practice logography after 320 and, we are told, amassed a fortune during the time of Demetrius.²⁹ With Demetrius'

²⁷ This motive, of course, is not unknown today. Indeed, the actual practice of law today, at least in the U.S., is much closer to Athenian practice than legal theory deems proper.

²⁸ See Lin Foxhall, "The Law and the Lady: Women and Legal Proceedings in Classical Athens," in *Greek Law in its Political Setting: Justifications Not Justice*, edited by Lin Foxhall and A. D. E. Lewis, 133–52 (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1996); David Cohen, *Law, Violence and Community in Classical Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1995).

²⁹ The main source for Dinarchus' life is the essay by Dionysius of Halicarnassus;

overthrow, Dinarchus was, or felt, threatened, because of his association with Demetrius or his great wealth or both, and so he sold his property, moved to Chalcis, and continued his practice, making even more money there.³⁰ Dionysius includes a catalogue of his speeches. Among the genuine speeches are 27 written for public cases and 32 for private cases. None of the private speeches survives, but we have one entire public speech and a substantial part of two others, all three written for the Harpalus affair in 324/3. Of the remaining public speeches more than half concern public figures who were active primarily before 320 and for the rest we have no indication of a date. The only private speech that can be dated is his suit against Proxenus, his host during a visit to Athens after his exile had ended in 292/1. Despite the large number of undated speeches, these figures suggest that until about 320 Dinarchus made his career primarily, though perhaps not exclusively, in the public sphere, and that after that date he concentrated on private cases, from which he grew rich. It appears that he had made a name for himself as a talented orator in public cases, and when these were no longer available to him, he reaped the benefit of his skills and of his Corinthian citizenship in the private sphere.

Dinarchus' career indicates that Athenian law continued to be used in much the same way as earlier: people still sued each other for contract violations or injuries suffered and still engaged logographers to assist them. But other literary evidence may suggest that the rich, especially, were making less use of the legal system, or at least were less engaged in litigation. Some support for this conclusion can be found in the contrast between the relatively large role litigation plays in the *Characters* of Theophrastus and the absence of litigation from the plays of Menander. Of Theophrastus' thirty sketches,³¹ fourteen mention participation in or include remarks about the legal process.³² For example, when the Garrulous Man (*lalos*, 7) serves on a jury, they have trouble

see also Ian Worthington, *A Historical Commentary on Dinarchus: Rhetoric and Conspiracy in Later Fourth-Century Athens* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1992) 3–12.

³⁰ He may have continued to write for Athenian courts even while living in Chalcis.

³¹ I use Jeffrey Rusten's text and translation of the *Characters* (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1993).

³² 1.2, 5.3, 6.8, 7.7, 8.11, 11.6, 12.5, 12.13, 13.3, 14.3, 17.8, 24.4, 26.5, 27.9, 29.2, 29.4a–5. These include several references to formal arbitration, which was part of the legal system.

reaching a verdict;³³ the Absent-minded Man (*anaisthētos*, 14) forgets to show up for his trial; the Griper (*mempsimoiros*, 17) criticizes his logographer even when he has won a unanimous verdict; and the Authoritarian (*oligarchikos*, 26) complains about all the troubles he faces from sycophants in court. These sketches and others suggest that litigation plays a significant role in the lives of their characters, and more generally that litigation was a significant feature of the lives of many Athenians at the time.³⁴

The *Characters* were written around 319 and thus portray life in the 320s. They show citizens engaged in the same sort of activities, including litigation, that we see in other sources for life in the fourth century, particularly oratory. Few of the plays of Menander can be dated precisely: his first production was around 321, his first victory may have come in 316, and he continued writing comedy until his death in 292. He particularly flourished under Demetrius, and we can thus take the last two decades of the fourth century as the historical background for most of his plays. As we shall see, despite their closeness in time, Menander presents a significantly different picture of legal activity from Theophrastus, a difference that arguably is related to historical changes. Of course, there are significant generic differences between the two author's work, but the same contrast is evident if we set Menander against Aristophanes, who never tired of finding humor in Athenian litigation.³⁵

By contrast, although Athenian law plays a role in many of Menander's comedies, it seems always to remain in the background. *The Sicyonian* is set in the context of an earlier case that was lost and for which money is now owed, and the plot of *Aspis* depends on Athenian laws regulating the marriage of "heiresses" and family law in general. But litigation is essentially absent from these plays and from the rest of Menander. Despite the importance of law for the plot of *Aspis*, for instance, no one in the play seriously contemplates litigation, though at one point Smicrines rejects a proposal, asking rhetorically, "and so I'll give him the girl and then if a son is born I'll be sued for taking his

³³ Athenian jurors did not have to discuss or agree on a verdict; they simply voted. Apparently the Garrulous Man talked so much, presumably as they were coming forward to cast their votes, that the jurors were too distracted to vote.

³⁴ To the extent that we can distinguish, most of the legal activity involves private cases; there is one reference to a public case (29.2).

³⁵ And not just in the *Wasps*; see Todd 1993, 148–50.

property?" (271–73). Similarly, the pimp in *Kolax* fears he may have to go to court if someone abducts his girl (132), but as far as we know he never does; the slave Syros in *Epitrepontes* threatens to take everyone to court if he does not get his way (401–2); and Polemon in *Perikeiromenē* is advised to lodge a complaint (ἔγκλημα, 500–3).³⁶ But all these legal actions are hypothetical, and there is no actual litigation or serious threat of litigation in any of the surviving fragments. The only quasi-legal scene is the informal arbitration from which *Epitrepontes* derives its name, but this is not part of, or a prelude to, litigation. Moreover, the arbitration settles a dispute between two slaves over possession of a baby's trinkets; Menander's stage is full of rich men with elaborate business dealings, but none of them is involved in litigation and there is no sense that litigation is important in their lives.

The impression we get from these sources (inadequate though they are) is that although formal legal procedures continue to be available for all, there is a considerable decrease in their use after about 320, especially by the rich. Is there anything in the reforms of Demetrius that may plausibly have helped produce such a change? The evidence for specific changes set forth at the beginning of this paper does not help us here. New sumptuary legislation, even if more far-reaching than our evidence indicates, can hardly have affected litigation in general; nor can the increase in the number of jurors in an *eisangelia*. We may speculate, however, that Demetrius' reforms, combined with some of the larger political forces at work at the time, may have affected the practice of litigation in important ways.

Two reasons for any reduction in the amount of litigation need to be considered: the removal of incentives to litigate and the removal of the need to do so. One major incentive for using the courts, the power and prestige litigation could bring, disappeared before Demetrius' rule began, when the loss of Athenian independence made power in the city dependent on external forces. After 322 it became clear that success or failure in the courts made little difference to one's political fate. All the major orators were exiled or dead except Dinarchus, who as a metic had no opportunity for political power in Athens and thus continued to write forensic speeches. As far as we can tell, the same legal procedures were still available, but there was no longer any reason to bring, say, a *graphē paranomōn* against a rival, since victory would not advance one's career

³⁶ It is not clear whether this would be a formal legal accusation.

but defeat might harm it.³⁷ This would hold also for private cases, many of which had earlier had a public dimension or motivation. The rich no longer saw any advantage in public competition, whether this took the form of litigation or of competition in the performance of liturgies or other sorts of public display. And thus, the peculiar Athenian symbiosis of broad-based democratic political power and aristocratic competition for individual honor³⁸ came to an end.

Under Demetrius, it appears, citizens avoided litigation and turned to their own private businesses, which flourished in a strong economy. We may perhaps assume that they brought litigation from time to time, but only when necessary.³⁹ One virtue of classical Athenian law, as Todd has recently emphasized (1993, 77–78), was that it was cheap. The city paid a subsistence allowance for jurors and a couple of functionaries were needed for trials, but it cost almost nothing to bring a suit or defend oneself, unless, of course, one wished to pay for the help of a logographer. But litigation could be quite expensive for the rich, who might need not only to pay logographers and other advisers and to devote much of their own time to litigation, but also to pay the heavy fines that might be assessed. Without the incentive of power and prestige, many cases would no longer be worth bringing.

The second cause of the reduction of litigation, the removal of the need, is more directly attributable to Demetrius. His good financial management is generally recognized,⁴⁰ and two measures in particular benefited the rich: peace brought the reduction of expenditures on military forces and an increase in revenues from trade; and the burden of liturgies was eliminated. The new sumptuary legislation reduced com-

³⁷ To judge from the surviving evidence, all cases of *graphē paranomōn* had a political dimension in addition to whatever legal point they were based on; see Harvey Yunis, "Law, Politics, and the *Graphē Paranomon* in Fourth-Century Athens," *GRBS* 29 (1988) 361–82.

³⁸ For which see Josiah Ober, *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1989; Cohen 1995).

³⁹ We might note, however, a possible parallel in late Roman Egypt: after about 500 AD use of the courts ceases almost completely and to our knowledge all disputes are settled privately (cf. the private settlement in *Epitrepontes*). The reasons for this are unclear, and to the extent that cost may be a factor, the situation may not provide a good parallel for Athens. See Trianos Gagos and Peter van Minnen, *Settling a Dispute: Toward a Legal Anthropology of Late Antique Egypt*. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1994), esp. 40–6.

⁴⁰ See, e.g. Claude Mossé, *La tyrannie dans la Grèce antique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1969), esp. 155–66.

petition among the rich in another area; and although the details of Ferguson's speculations about contracts and wills must be rejected (see above), it is not impossible that Demetrius laid down some new rules for financial transactions that removed potential areas of conflict and generally made business dealings more efficient.

This brings us to the broader sense in which philosophical considerations may have influenced Demetrius' legislation. Legal historians and jurists generally consider classical Athenian law to be unsystematic and disorderly to the point of chaos. As speakers themselves note, several different procedures with quite different penalties were often available for prosecution of a given offense, and the vagueness of statutes and the complete autonomy of jurors put the burden of a case on the individual speakers, who had wide leeway in trying to influence the verdict. No philosopher, ancient or modern, could be happy with this, except perhaps a follower of Heraclitus (whose remark that δίκη is ἔρις would be an accurate characterization of classical Athenian law). Plato, who witnessed one result of this system in the execution of his teacher Socrates,⁴¹ creates a highly precise and systematic set of laws in implicit reaction to the Athenian system, and at several points in his *Nomoi* Theophrastus seems to imply that improvements could be made to Athenian law. The long fragment quoted by Stobaeus on contracts, for example (650 FHS&G), includes much more detail than the relevant Athenian statute would have had in the classical period. Thus, the fourth-century philosophers appear to agree that there should be greater precision and order in legislation, and this conceptual goal may have helped shape some of the rules enacted by Demetrius.

It is unlikely, however, that Demetrius followed Theophrastus (in the fragment just cited) or Plato in categorizing crimes according to mental states. In practice the inclusion of mental states in the definitions of offenses would only create more opportunity for someone wishing to bring litigation and would give more power to the jurors, who in Athens were ordinarily confronted only with broad distinctions between intentional and unintentional⁴² but would now have to decide more difficult questions concerning rationality and justice. It is hard to imagine that in

⁴¹ Demetrius also wrote an *Apology of Socrates*, but the surviving fragments (102–9 = 91–98 W) give no indication of Demetrius' view of the Athenian legal system.

⁴² Athenian law did, however, provide that the maker of a will needed to be mentally competent and not under the influence of a woman.

his effort to make the law more advantageous for the middle class Demetrius would wish to enact a measure that would effectively increase the use of the courts and grant greater power to juries.⁴³

Classical Athenian law was unusual in its freedom from the systematic guidance of jurists and legal philosophers. The revision of the laws between 410 and 403 was intended only to bring some degree of order to provisions that had been enacted over the course of two centuries. Nicomachus and his colleagues were supposed to delete laws that were no longer in effect or that conflicted with other laws; they were not charged with enacting new legislation, let alone enacting more systematic legislation. The principle of organization they apparently followed was that laws were grouped according to the magistrate in charge, which still left diverse subjects treated side-by-side. After 403 new legislation had to be approved by a board of *nomothetai*, but there is no indication that they did more than examine each proposed law for conflicts with existing laws. Under Demetrius the Athenians for the first time had an intellectual in charge of legislation. It would have been reasonable for him to take a few steps, at least, toward making Athenian law more orderly.

4. After Demetrius

In 307 with the defeat of Cassander, the other Demetrius, later titled Poliorcetes, took over as ruler of Athens. Demetrius of Phalerum was exiled and “democracy” (after a fashion) was restored. Many of the previous reforms, such as the abolition of the liturgies, remained in effect under the new regime, but a board of *nomothetai* was instituted to propose new laws. These recommended some new laws, including one banning philosophical schools that (as already mentioned) was repealed not long afterwards; but there is no good evidence that the new regime began, or even contemplated, “a revision of the law code” (as Ferguson terms it).⁴⁴ The *nomothetai* probably did nothing more than propose whatever new laws seemed to them desirable, and as far as we can tell, the legal system remained pretty much the same. There was a brief period of political competition among individuals—Demochares, Stratocles, and others—reminiscent of the period before 322, but it soon

⁴³ Cf. the remarks on Solon’s legislation in *Ath. Pol.* 7.2.

⁴⁴ See above, n. 11 for Ferguson’s misreading of Polybius.

became clear that an individual's fortunes were still more subject to events elsewhere than to any victory he might achieve in an Athenian forum. The world had changed, and the legal reforms of Demetrius of Phalerum, which to a large extent reflected this changed world, remained largely intact.

In conclusion, since our evidence does not allow us to know Demetrius' legislation in detail, I have concentrated instead on changes in the way the legal system actually worked in Athens. I have suggested that although much of the substantive and procedural law probably remained the same, the system would no longer have served its earlier role as an important public forum for aristocratic competition, and that overall use of the legal process thus probably declined substantially. This shift was obviously attributable in part to the political realities of the new Hellenistic world, but Demetrius' reforms were consistent with these larger changes in the world and helped the legal system adjust to them. His reforms also may have served the general philosophical desire for greater order and precision. By the time Demetrius was swept out of power, the democrats, nostalgic for past glories, would have had to create an entirely new legal system to revive the large public role Athenian law had played in earlier years; and given the political realities, it is doubtful whether even wholesale reform could have succeeded at that point. Demetrius' legal reforms had essentially solidified the new spirit of law that the changed world required.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ I would like to thank Stephen Todd for comments on an earlier draft of this paper.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

5

Demetrius of Phalerum: A Politician among Philosophers and a Philosopher among Politicians

Hans B. Gottschalk

It has been said that philosophy, for Plato, was politics continued by other means. If politics is taken to mean, as Plato intended it to be, the search for a society that would secure the best possible life for all its members, there is much truth in this witticism. Plato himself made several attempts to create a philosopher-king in Syracuse, and while these failed, some of his pupils, notably Hermias of Atarneus, succeeded on a smaller scale, at least for a time.¹ From Plato's school this practice passed to others, notably the Peripatos and Stoa, and in the Hellenistic era it became common for philosophers to be employed as advisers to kings (and later to Roman magistrates abroad)² and to act as negotiators or constitution-makers for Greek cities, occupying a position rather like that of Lord Franks in post-war Britain. A sentence in Strato's will sug-

¹ See I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (Göteborg 1957) 272–83, for the sources. The tradition that Aristotle also gave detailed political advice to Alexander is much less securely based; the letter from him to Alexander preserved in Arabic and edited by J. Bielawsky and M. Plezia in 1970 is almost certainly spurious; cf. the review by O. Murray and C. Montague, *JHS* 93 (1973) 226–8.

² Cf. J. Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy* (Göttingen 1978) 21ff.

gests that in his day many members of the Peripatos regarded such activity as an attractive alternative to a career of teaching and research.³ The famous Athenian embassy to Rome in 155 BC is only one example in a well-established tradition.⁴ An earlier one whose consequences reached further and lasted longer was the activity of Demetrius of Phaleron, who for ten years, 317–307 BC, governed Athens on behalf of the Macedonian power.

Demetrius' career began in 324 BC, so he must have been born by 350 at the latest, and perhaps a little earlier, in the mid-350s.⁵ He is described as an adherent of Theophrastus, but must have joined the Peripatos while Aristotle was still alive. He remained loyal to his school and to Theophrastus all his life, making it possible for him to establish the Peripatos on a permanent basis by securing for him the right to buy real estate in Athens, a privilege normally restricted to Athenian citizens; he may also have given him some financial assistance, although there is no evidence for this. He was a man of varied gifts, a voluminous writer and one of the leading orators of his day, as well as a statesman. Cicero describes him as the only man to attain the highest rank as a political thinker and a man of action (57 SOD = fr. 72 W), and it is this combination of roles that has fascinated modern scholars: debate about his life and work has centred on the question whether, or to what extent, his policies were determined by the philosophy he learned, or could have learned, in Aristotle's school. Until the middle of the present century there was a consensus that he tried, deliberately and consciously, to put Academic and Aristotelian political principles into practice. Since then opinion has veered away from this view as several important studies have been published, showing that most of his reforms could have been motivated by practical considerations and historical experience more

³ Strato fr. 10 Wehrli, ap. Diog. Laert. 5.62.

⁴ On this see Critolaus frr. 5–10 Wehrli. Another example is the Peripatetic Prytanis, formerly known chiefly as the lawgiver who drew up the constitution of Megalopolis (Polyb. 5.93.8); a decree of 226 BC found in the Athenian Agora in 1933 (*Hesperia* 4 [1935] 525–9) and republished by L. Moretti, *Inscr.storiche ellenistiche* I (Firenze 1967) no. 28, honours him for a successful embassy on behalf of Athens to Antigonos Doson. From this inscription we also learn that he came from Karystos and his father's name was Astykleides.

⁵ The ancient evidence for Demetrius' life has been collected by Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 4, frr. 1–71, and Jacoby, *FGrH* 228 T 1–11; both have useful commentaries. E. Bayer, *Demetrius Phalereus der Athener* (Darmstadt 1969) 1 and Wehrli pick the later date; I join Prof. Tracy (this volume) in preferring the earlier one.

than the desire to implement a philosophical programme. In trying to strike a balance between these alternatives, I shall first present a brief outline, as objective as the evidence allows, of his political career; then I shall say something about his writings and philosophical opinions; lastly, I shall ask how these two sides of his activity relate to each other and to the philosophical tradition in which he was educated.

I

We first meet Demetrius at the time of the Harpalos affair, in 324 BC; he may have joined in the prosecution of Demosthenes, but the details are obscure.⁶ Two years later, after the death of Alexander the Great and the defeat of the revolt of the Greek cities against Macedon at the battle of Krannon (322), he seems to have been a member of the Athenian embassy to Antipater, the Macedonian commander (and friend of Aristotle) whom Alexander had left behind as his viceroy. The terms obtained on this occasion were harsh: a constitution was imposed on Athens in which the minimum census for obtaining full citizen rights was fixed at 2000 drachmai, and an attempt was made to resettle many of the disenfranchised poor in "colonies" in Thrace. It did not last long, however. Antipater died in 319; he designated Polyperchon as his successor and he, faced with the rivalry of the other "successors" of Alexander, decided to curry popular support in Greece by abrogating Antipater's settlement and returning to the *status quo ante*. Democracy was restored at Athens and the leaders of the pro-Macedonian party, among them Phocion, were executed. Demetrius, who was associated with them, was sentenced to death, but the sentence could not be carried out because he was not in Athens at the time. But the new rulers were unable to expel Antipater's garrison from Munychia, from where it controlled the Peiraeus. A year later Cassander, Antipater's son, anxious to regain what he regarded as his rightful inheritance, sailed to Greece with a fleet, and the democratic government of Athens decided to negotiate a new settlement with him. The terms were that Athens and the Peiraeus should be reunited, although a Macedonian garrison, now acknowledging Cassander as its chief, should remain on Munychia "temporarily"; the qualification for full citizenship was fixed at 1000 drachmai, and the government of Athens was to be headed by an ἐπιμελητής "elected" by

⁶ See Jacoby on T 1.

the people, “whomever Cassander should choose.” Demetrius, who negotiated this compromise, was chosen. Later writers could describe it as a restoration of democracy or as a tyranny; the circumstances of its institution lend some plausibility to either view.⁷

Not content to be a mere administrator, Demetrius set himself to reshape the political and social life of Athens. This is not the place to discuss the details or chronology of his reforms, but broadly they fall under three heads.

1) Constitutional: the franchise was limited to those with property worth 1000 drachmai or more. Election of magistrates and councillors was substituted for choice by lot and the rules to ensure equal tribal representation were relaxed. To ensure the strict observance of the constitution, νομοφύλακες were instituted, probably seven in number, with priestly insignia to enhance their dignity and powers to control the acts of the Council and Assembly.⁸ The procedure for cases brought by εἰσαγγελία was overhauled, the number of jurors being fixed at one thousand five hundred. The jurisdiction of the Areopagos had already been enlarged to include all criminal cases in 322, and this was retained.

2) Social: stringent regulations limited expenditure on banquets, women’s dress, etc., funerals and grave-monuments. Trading in the market was regulated to prevent violent fluctuations of prices. A special set of magistrates, the γυναικόνόμοι, was created to enforce these laws and exercise a general surveillance over public morals.⁹

⁷ We have two sources for the nature of Demetrius’ position, Diod. Sic. 18.74 = 16A = fr. 13 W, and a decree in Demetrius’ honour, probably passed during his years of power, IG II² 1201 = 16B = fr. 12. The first says that “One Athenian citizen should be appointed (καταστήσαι) ἐπιμελητής, whomever Cassander should approve; and Demetrius was chosen (ἡρέθη)”; the second, that “Demetrius was chosen (αἰρεθεὶς) by the people.” In the context of the inscription, αἰρεθεὶς could mean ‘having been elected,’ but in Diodorus the word is neutral and could mean no more than that Cassander selected Demetrius. The ambiguity is characteristic and probably intentional. Cf. W.S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1911) 36f.

⁸ Ferguson (above, n. 7) 44ff.; id. “The Laws of Demetrius of Phalerum and their Guardians,” *Klio* 11 (1911) 271ff; Jacoby on *FGrH* 228 F 26, 328 F 64; E. Bayer, *Demetrius Phalereus der Athener* (Darmstadt 1969) 25ff; H-J.Gehrke, “Das Verhältniss von Politik und Philosophie im Wirken des D. von Ph.,” *Chiron* 8 (1978) 151ff. There is some evidence that there were νομοφύλακες in Athens before the time of Demetrius, but he greatly enhanced the importance of this office.

⁹ Only the regulation of burials is expressly attributed to Demetrius by an ancient writer (Cicero *Leg.* 2.63ff = fr. 135 W); the rest of the social legislation, including the title of the γυναικονόμοι, is known from fragments of contemporary comedies, but Demetrius’ responsibility has been inferred by historians since Boeckh. Cf. Martini *RE* 4.2825ff., Bayer (above, n. 8) 51ff., Gehrke (above, n. 8) 162ff.

3) Fiscal and administrative: *leitourgiai* were abolished, both those connected with dramatic and other festivals (*choregiai*, etc.) and the *trierarchiai*; the costs formerly met by these means were henceforth paid out of public funds, special officials, *agonothetai* etc., being appointed to administer the festivals. Payments from the Theoric Fund were abolished and ephebe-service confined to the classes qualified for the franchise. A complete census of the population was made, probably in connection with drawing-up the new citizen-list, and some adjustments were made in the functions of minor officials such as the *Agoranomoi*. Apparently measures were also taken to encourage the keeping of reliable records of wills and transfers or mortgages of real estate, but there is no proof of legislation to this end.¹⁰ Demetrius' day-to-day policies were in harmony with his legislative reforms. Foreign adventures were avoided and the fleet and army reduced to a level in keeping with Athens' real power; this would have had the incidental effect of further reducing the influence of the lower classes, who provided the rowers.¹¹ At home, trade and industry were fostered; extravagance in public expenditure was avoided, but resources were made available for some public building and religious festivals were celebrated with suitable magnificence.¹² A point where his policy and his private interests met was the encouragement of philosophy; in addition to Theophrastus, we are told that he helped, or tried to help, Xenocrates, Theodorus "the Atheist" and Crates the Cynic.¹³

As a result Athens was a haven of peace and prosperity in a world torn by the unending wars of Alexander's former officers; this was admitted

¹⁰ Bayer (above, n. 8) 48ff. against Ferguson (*Klio* 11) 265. The abolition of *leitourgiai*, like most of the social legislation, is not attributed to Demetrius in the ancient sources; the fact and its approximate date are known from inscriptions and the rest is inference; cf. Martini (above, n. 9) 2825, Gehrke (above, n. 8) 171ff. On a small point, it has been noticed that Theophrastus took particular care over the technical details of his will, and this suggests that he approved of these measures and may even have helped to inspire them; cf. Ferguson (above, n. 8) 267, H.B. Gottschalk, *Hermes* 100 (1972) 320.

¹¹ Duris ap.Ath. 12.542b = 43 = fr. 34 W. Martini (above, n. 9) 2822 infers from Diodorus 20.45.2 = 30 = fr. 50 that Demetrius kept a large force of mercenaries, but this is unwarranted; the troops referred to there belonged to the Macedonian garrison stationed on Munychia, between the Peiraeus and Athens.

¹² 1, 54, 50 = frr. 28–30, 132 W. Theophrastus would have approved, as the quotation in Cic. *Off.* 2.56 (= fr. 514 FHS&G) shows. But Demetrius is said to have criticised Pericles' expenditure on the Propylaea of the Acropolis (110 = fr. 137); that evidently exceeded the proper mean.

¹³ 48–9, 33, 32 = frr. 43–4, 58–9 W.

even by hostile critics, although they tried to dismiss Demetrius' achievements as those of a blinkered treasury official.¹⁴ Yet there remained a current of discontent with the political restrictions at home and Athens' impotence abroad which Demetrius, with a curious lack of political instinct, did nothing to allay or guard against. An attempt by the democratic faction in 312–311 to detach Athens from Cassander and bring her into the rival league formed by Antigonos, came to nothing. Four years later Antigonos' son Demetrius, later known as Poliorketes, appeared unexpectedly off the Attic coast with a fleet, entered the Peiraeus before anyone realised what was happening, and proclaimed that he had come to liberate Athens (307 BC). The Phalerean was taken by surprise and, after an abortive resistance, accepted a safe-conduct to Thebes. There he remained until the death of Cassander in 297 put an end to his hopes of regaining power; then he migrated to Alexandria. His choice of refuge will have been partly determined by political considerations—any opponent of Antigonos and his son could hope for Ptolemy's protection, if not more—but also by Ptolemy's patronage of letters and interest in the Peripatos; he had invited Theophrastus to Alexandria, and later appointed Strato as tutor to his son and heir.¹⁵ This must have happened before 300, for one of the results of Strato's stay in Alexandria was a lasting friendship with Ptolemy's daughter Arsinoe, who married Lysimachos c. 300 and did not return to Alexandria until after Strato had become head of the Peripatetic School at Athens.¹⁶

In Alexandria Demetrius assisted Ptolemy in establishing a framework of laws for his newly constituted kingdom and may have been instrumental in the foundation of the Museum and Library.¹⁷ He seems to have retained the king's confidence as long as he lived, but showed no more flair for the intrigues of the court than Athenian politics. Ptolemy I (Soter) had two wives, Eurydice the daughter of Antipater, and

¹⁴ τελώνης βάνανσος, Demochares ap. Polyb. 12.13.7 = **89** = fr. 132 W.

¹⁵ Diog. Laert. 5.37, 58.

¹⁶ The view that Strato owed his appointment to Demetrius' influence appears to be mistaken; if the latter had already been in Alexandria, he could have taken on the tutorship himself. This gives rise to an interesting speculation. Since the younger Ptolemy was born in 308, he would have been very young to have a philosopher as tutor, but his sister Arsinoe, born in 316, would have been about the right age. Was Strato employed as her tutor, before being passed on to her brother?

¹⁷ **38, 59, 58** = frr. 63, 66–7 W. The details are controversial; cf. Bayer (above, n. 8) 93ff., 104ff., and P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria I* (Oxford 1972) 314ff., with the documentation in the notes.

Berenice, whose sons were rivals for the succession. Demetrius supported the claims of Eurydice's son Ptolemy Keraunos. He had good reasons: Eurydice was Soter's legitimate wife (Berenice only became his wife when Eurydice left him, after the succession had been decided, probably about 290) and she was the daughter of Antipater and sister of Cassander; so respect for morality and personal loyalty would have pulled him in the same direction. But Soter decided in favour of Berenice's son, later known as Ptolemy Philadelphos; he probably had good reasons too, because this son (and his elder sister Arsinoe, whom he later married) were outstandingly gifted. Later Demetrius seems to have compounded his mistake by advising Soter against making his heir joint king, and again his advice was rejected (285). Philadelphos did not forgive him; when Soter died and he became sole king, he banished Demetrius to Diospolis (in the middle of the Nile delta), and he died soon after of the bite of an asp. As Diogenes tells the story, it looks like an accident, but Cicero hints that it may have been deliberately arranged by the king.¹⁸ We can give Philadelphos the benefit of the doubt; he had nothing to fear from the old man and could have used more direct methods, if he had wanted him killed.

II

It is time to turn to Demetrius' writings. All of them are concerned with ethics or politics, history and the history of literature—subjects which were only one part of the universal interests of Aristotle and Theophrastus, but became the exclusive preoccupation of many of their pupils, some of whom were not philosophers in any real sense. There is one possible exception, a work of which we only know the title, Περὶ τοῦ δοκού. I have deliberately left the noun unaccented, for its meaning depends on where its accent is placed. If it is placed on the last syllable, δokoû would denote a kind of meteor and the title would be appropriate to a work on natural science, but this usage is late, first attested in Pliny the Elder; if on the first, δόκου could mean 'opinion', as opposed to knowledge, and is so used by Xenophanes (FV 21 B 34) and Callimachus (fr. 224 Pf); most scholars hold that this is the meaning Demetrius intended, and in this case his book would have dealt with

¹⁸ Diog. Laert. 5.78, Cic. *Pro Rabirio* 23 = 42 = fr. 71 W. Jacoby on 228 T 1 (p. 643) points out that Cicero may have been using a Peripatetic source.

epistemology. But nothing we hear about Demetrius suggests that he was interested in problems of this kind, and I wonder if the word as he used it here could have meant something like 'opinionatedness', by a modification similar to that undergone by the word τῦφος, from 'delusion' to 'vanity' or 'arrogance'. A saying attributed to him by Diogenes Laertius,^{18a} "One should strip off the pride of arrogant men, but leave their spirit unimpaired," shows that he thought about this kind of thing.

Demetrius cannot have had much leisure for writing during his years as governor of Athens and most of his literary works will have been composed later, particularly during his ten years at Thebes, when time must have hung heavy on his hands and he was still at the height of his powers. To this period must belong his collection of his speeches (see **120ff.** = fr. 174ff. W) and a series of short pamphlets, of one book each, with such titles as *About the Ten Years*, *In Defence of the Constitution* and *Denunciation of the Athenians* (**13B, 19, 53, 89, 110, 115, 116A–B, 156, 164** = fr. 131–8), whose purpose seems to have been to defend Demetrius' rule of the city; perhaps they took the form of unspoken orations like those of Isocrates. Some at least of his philosophical dialogues must have been written at the same time. In the *Περὶ τῆς τύχης* (**82A–B** = fr. 81), Demetrius claimed that "fifty years ago" nobody could have foreseen the collapse of the Persian empire or the dominance of Macedon. It is not certain that we should take this figure literally, but if we do, it must have been written before 300 BC; by 350 the rise of Macedon was a fact and Isocrates at least could imagine Philip leading a pan-Hellenic crusade to defeat Persia (Isocrates' Letter to Philip was published in 346 BC). The events of 307 might well have stimulated Demetrius to reflect on the vicissitudes of fortune. I cannot understand how Wehrli could date this work to 280.

Another work which can be connected with events of these years is Demetrius' *Apology of Socrates*. One of the more serious consequences of Demetrius' fall was an action taken against the philosophical schools

^{18a} **1** = fr. 119 W = DL 5.82 τῶν τετυφωμένων ἀνδρῶν ἔφη τὸ μὲν "ψος δεῖν περιαιρεῖν, τὸ δὲ φρόνημα καταλείπειν. The meaning of "ψος must be the one given in the text; cf. O. Apelt, who renders it by 'Hoffart' in his German translation of Diogenes (Leipzig, 1921). Hicks' translation in the Loeb edition, 'stature', which goes back to Aldobrandini's 'altitudinem', is absurd; would he dock the unfortunates' heads or feet? But LSJ give no exact parallel for this meaning of the word, and it would appear to be an extension of its range similar to the one I have postulated for δόκος. Was this a peculiarity of Demetrius' usage?

at Athens. At the instigation of one Sophocles, the son of Amphiclides, a law was passed that nobody was to open a philosophical school without the permission of the Council and People, on pain of death. Thereupon all the philosophers left Athens in a body. A year later a certain Philo, perhaps the Philo of Alopeke named among the witnesses of Theophrastus' will, brought a γραφήπαράνομων against Sophocles; in spite of the fact that he was supported by Demochares, the nephew of Demosthenes and an old opponent of Demetrius, Sophocles was fined fifty talents, his law was repealed and the philosophers returned to Athens.¹⁹

Most historians²⁰ since Wilamowitz have interpreted this episode as a personal attack on Theophrastus, but this does violence to the evidence and misses the real point of what was going on. Our authorities agree in saying that the law applied to all philosophers and that they all left Athens;²¹ Athenaeus puts Sophocles' measure on a level with the Roman and Spartan prohibitions of philosophy and quotes a fragment of Alexis in this connection which cannot reasonably be anything other than an attack on Xenocrates and the Academy.²² Sophocles' intention must have been, if not to expel the philosophers, at least to bring them under a measure of state control, much as the more prominent religious cults had long been supervised by the civil authorities. Demochares' speech in support of Sophocles contained violent abuse of Socrates, the Academy and Aristotle; its main purpose was to prove that philosophers are

¹⁹ Diog. Laert. 5.38, Athen. 11.508f., 13.610f. For Philo, cf. Diog. Laert. 5.57; according to Athenaeus, he was Ἀριστοτέλους γνώριμος and wrote a λόγος against Sophocles. For Demochares, see *FGrH* 75 T 2, F4; Düring (above, n. 1) T 58q; id., *Herodicus the Crateteian* (Stockholm 1941) 84ff., 149ff.; and the fragments of his speeches in Baier-Sauppe, *Orat. Att.* II 341. Cf. Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Berlin 1881) 194ff.; Ferguson (above, n. 7) 104ff.; Regenbogen, *RE* Suppl. 7, 1360; C. Natali, *La scuola dei filosofi* (L'Aquila 1981) 149ff.

²⁰ Exceptions are P. Boyancé, *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecques* (Paris 1937) 315; Düring (above, n. 19) 149–51; Natali 151.

²¹ The only reason for associating it with Theophrastus in particular is that Diogenes refers to it in his Life of Theophrastus and nowhere else. But this could be a coincidence.

²² Ath. 610e = Alexis fr. 327 Kock; it is not quite certain that the poet was alluding to Sophocles' law; cf. Regenbogen (above, n. 19) 1360. Wilamowitz' interpretation can only be described as bizarre. The Demetrius referred to in this fragment cannot be the Phalerean, as Gulick thinks (in the Loeb ed. ad loc.), because he certainly never expelled any philosophers or other teachers; Alexis must have confused him with Poliorketes, but it is odd to find the latter coupled with the *nomothetai*, as he is here.

bad citizens and congenitally unpatriotic, but the extant fragments include no reference to Theophrastus or any philosopher living in 306. The fragments attributed to Demetrius' *Apology of Socrates* are also quite general, arguing that the Athenians never appreciated philosophers at their true worth (105–8 = frr. 91–94). It looks as if Demetrius was making a reply to Demochares and attempting to influence a debate on a matter which he must have regarded as vitally important. Demochares' inclusion of Socrates in his strictures gave him an opportunity of doing so without raising embarrassing questions about philosophers' allegiance to foreign powers and to use a literary form that had already become well established.²³

Other works certainly or probably belong to the time when he lived in Alexandria: the paeon he is said to have written in honour of Sarapis (1 = fr. 68) and the *Περὶ ὀνείρων* (86 = fr. 99) which, if genuine, may have been inspired by a real healing experience, the historical writings about Jews and Egypt attributed to him (65–6 = frr. 201–2) and perhaps the writings about Homer and other poets (143–6 = frr. 190–4).²⁴ The rest are less easy to date, but one, the *Catalogue of Archons* (ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή) can only have been compiled at Athens; Demetrius must have written it as a very young man, before the start of his political career.²⁵ It was a characteristically Peripatetic product, a list of Athenian archons with notes on the events of their year of office; at least for the early period, some happenings outside Athens seem to have been included.

Another work of the same kind was the *Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας* (95–101 = frr. 139–47). Like the *Anagraphe*, it was a long work (five books) and was used as a quarry by later grammarians look-

²³ Wehrli's view that Demetrius was replying to Aristoxenus' attack on Socrates (fr. 51ff. W) is possible, but robs the work of its topicality and does not explain the generalised character of his criticism of the Athenians.

²⁴ The Letter of Aristeas claims that Demetrius was instrumental in persuading Ptolemy to commission the Greek translation of the Old Testament, or at least the Pentateuch, but the details are too obscure for us to be sure what his real contribution was. Cf. 59, 58B = frr. 66–7, with Wehrli's commentary.

²⁵ 92–4, 103, 109, 155 = frr. 149–54 W, F 1–3, 10 Jac. Although its title is attested by several citations, it is not included in Diogenes' list of Demetrius' works (1 = fr. 74 W). If this is based on the catalogue of his writings in the Alexandrian library (so Jacoby on 228 T 1, p. 643f.; Wehrli on fr. 74 is more reserved), which would probably have been presented by Demetrius himself, the reason may be that he did not have a copy in his possession during his exile.

ing for facts to illustrate the speeches of the Attic orators. It seems to have been a systematic treatise on Athenian law, especially in its constitutional and procedural aspects, and the extant fragments show no trace of any attempt to justify Demetrius' own legislation. Jacoby has compared it to c.42ff. of Aristotle's *Ath. Pol.*,²⁶ and Theophrastus' *Περὶ νόμων* is another parallel. These writings reveal the direction of Demetrius' interests: not so much in abstract political theory, but in the facts of historical experience and how government actually works. Aristotle had emphasised the importance of such facts for theory, but for him the discovery of facts was not the primary task of the philosopher. Demetrius' approach is that of the second generation of Peripatetics, closer to that of Theophrastus than Aristotle. Our authorities are right to associate him with Theophrastus in particular.

There is even less to say about Demetrius' other works. We only know the titles of most of them (**1–2, 80** = frr. 74–6), but they are enough to show that they fitted easily into the current of "exoteric" Peripatetic writings. Many of the ethical works were dialogues, and many have titles also found among the works of other members of his school, especially Theophrastus: **1, 82–5** = frr. 77–87 (except fr. 78 *Περὶ μεγαλοψυχίας*, but the Aristotelian character of this term hardly needs pointing out); the *On Rhetoric* and the books on Homer (**130–41, 143–6** = 156–73, 190–3). An interest in Socrates (**103–9** = 91–8) and Plato (**133** = 195) was shared by all pupils of Aristotle—his school was probably not distinguished clearly from Plato's while Demetrius was in Athens—and Dicaearchus, at least, shared his interest in the Seven Sages (**87** = 114, cf. **93** = 149). Even his collection of Aesopic fables, the first and, it seems, only one in classical Greece,²⁷ fits into this context. However, Demetrius seems to have avoided the extravagances of some of his colleagues. Except for the *On Dreams*, whose authenticity has been questioned by Del Corno,²⁸ we hear of no tales of miracles or "paradoxa," and his books seem to have been free of the unctuous moralising of a Clearchus or Heraclides.

²⁶ Jacoby on 228 F 4, p. 646.

²⁷ Cf. B.E.Perry, in the Loeb ed. of Babrius and Phaedrus, xiiiiff., with further references.

²⁸ *Graec. de re oneirocritica scr.reliquiae* (Milan 1969) 138f.

III

Returning now to Demetrius' political acts, all his measures had a common aim. His constitution tried to achieve political stability by placing the government in the hands of the middle and upper classes, while only depriving a minority of the poorest citizens of the franchise. His social and fiscal changes had the purpose of preventing the dissipation of existing wealth, whether by public benefactions or private extravagance. This was the reason for his sumptuary laws, not any strong disapproval of high living; Demetrius' own way of life was anything but puritanical, and he was prepared to hold sumptuous public festivals, when the occasion warranted it.²⁹ It has been maintained that these changes were suggested to Demetrius by the political teaching of Aristotle and Theophrastus, and amounted to nothing less than an attempt to translate Peripatetic theory into practice.³⁰ Aristotle and Theophrastus would certainly have approved the general tenor of his reforms, and in *Pol.* 4–6 (where he is concerned with attainable, rather than ideal, constitutions) Aristotle emphasises both that power should rest with the middle class and that the franchise should be wide enough to include a majority of free citizens.³¹ But the only one of his measures expressly recommended in their extant works is the abolition of *leitourgiai* at *Ar. Pol.* 1309a14ff. Thus Bayer and Gehrke are on strong ground when they argue that Demetrius' legislation was determined by his sense of what was desirable in the actual situation in which Athens was placed rather than any preconceived doctrines. His freedom was in any case limited. The restriction on the franchise and generally undemocratic character of his government had been imposed by Cassander, although his constitution was considerably more liberal than the one imposed by Antipater in 322. Bayer (p. 20) is inclined to give the credit for

²⁹ 43, 89 = frr. 34–5, 132 W. For Demetrius' attitude to *choregiai*, see 115 = fr. 136.

³⁰ Ferguson (above, n. 7) 39; (above, n. 8) 268f.; Martini 2827; Cohn, *Mnemosyne* n.s. 54 (1926) 92ff. Contra Bayer (above, n. 8) 21–93 et passim, Regenbogen (above, n. 19) 1359, Gehrke (above, n. 8) passim.

³¹ *Pol.* 4.11, esp. 1295b34ff.; cf. 5.1.1302a14ff., 2.1307a11ff. These aims may seem to be incompatible, and Aristotle admits that the "intermediate" constitution he favoured would be closer to a democracy than an oligarchy, and all the more likely to endure for that reason. On the importance of the mean in the teaching of these books see E. Schtrumpf in the introduction to his German translation of the *Politics*, vol. 3 (Berlin 1996) 130ff.

this to Cassander, but our sources suggest that it was the outcome of negotiation, and since Cassander had no direct experience of Athenian affairs, it is likely that Demetrius guided him in this direction; his memory of the difficulty of implementing the earlier policy under Phocion's leadership would have reinforced Aristotle's teaching and led him to see that this was where the appropriate mean lay.³² Other features, such as the election of magistrates and the abolition of payment for attending the assembly, were traditionally associated with this type of constitution. Where there is reason to believe that Demetrius may have been influenced by a literary source, it turns out to be Plato as often as Aristotle: parts of his sumptuary legislation correspond to proposals advanced in the *Laws*,³³ and the idea of νομοφύλακες may have come from the same source, although Plato's conception of this office was different from that of Demetrius.³⁴ The regulations concerning funerals have a precedent in the laws of Solon as well as Plato.³⁵

But if the details of Demetrius' legislation were drawn from a variety of sources, traditional as well as literary, the code he made out of them conformed more closely to the model recommended by Aristotle than to any other. It was also coherent and effective and, in one respect, unique. While it was not uncommon for cities to acquire new law-codes in the second half of the fourth century, they were mostly drawn up by experts, often philosophers, brought in from outside.³⁶ When Demetrius legislated for Athens, he was in charge of the government and responsible for making the new system work. No other statesman in a similar position ever tried to impose equally comprehensive changes on a major city.³⁷ This calls for an explanation, and since his Peripatetic training is what distinguished him from most other Greek politicians, it is reasonable to look for it there, as most historians have instinctively done. But it would

³² Cf. Ferguson (above, n. 11) 36ff., Gehrke (above, n. 8) 181ff.

³³ Bayer (above, n. 8) 54ff.; the chief passage is *Laws* 775aff., whose provisions are paralleled by restrictions on banqueting referred to by the comic poets.

³⁴ Plato's νομοφύλακες have many of the functions of Demetrius' γυναικόνομοι (e.g. *Laws* 775b), and Plato has no γυναικόνομοι. Gehrke 164ff. emphasises that there remain considerable differences between them, but these concern details, not the principle of the thing.

³⁵ Cic. *Leg.* 2.63ff. = 53 = fr. 135 W; Solon ap.(Dem.) 43.62, cf. Plut. *Solon* 21.5; Pl. *Laws* 958dff., 959e; cf. Bayer (above, n. 8) 62ff.

³⁶ E.g. Aristotle is said to have given laws to Stagira (Diog. Laert. 5.4, cf. Düring [above, n. 1] 290). Other instances are given by Plut. *Adv. Col.* 1126aff.

³⁷ The difference between "lawgivers" and ordinary politicians has been emphasised by Schütrumpf (above, n. 31) 140ff. and 215f.

be a mistake to think that Aristotle's school imposed a rigid dogma on its members. The mark of a true Peripatetic was the freedom with which he handled the ideas he inherited and applied them to whatever problems he had to deal with in science, scholarship or politics. Demetrius' debt to his school can be traced in his conviction that political and social problems could be solved by legislation, in the knowledge of legal and constitutional history which enabled him to choose the most appropriate means of achieving his ends, and in the historical awareness which allowed him to see that Athens had to find a new role in the world ruled by the successors of Alexander, and that this necessitated reforms going beyond the constitutional tinkering needed to keep one faction in power. For us, Demetrius' career raises a more general question. How can we measure the impact of a political philosophy on policy-making? What is the effect of such a philosophy on the practical measures a statesman is likely to take? It is seldom possible to translate philosophical ideals directly into fact; reality is too intractable for that. Aristotle did not only advocate an ideal form of government, but was prepared to recommend ways of making less than ideal constitutions work, if they were the best that could be achieved in given circumstances.³⁸ In the circumstances of fourth-century Greece, he envisaged a judicious mixture of oligarchic and democratic elements as the best that could be hoped for. Political theory can analyse the interaction of different groups within the state; it can show which constitutional mechanism is most likely to secure a stable and cohesive society, but it cannot teach the secret of political success. Demetrius was not a born political leader, perhaps because he did not appreciate the power of passion, of gut-feeling, as a motive force; his speeches, Cicero tells us, could give aesthetic pleasure, but not arouse his hearers and set them on fire (121 = fr. 175 W). His policies were successful in a limited way; they made the best of the situation in which Athens was placed in 318, and secured internal stability and prosperity for a time. But Demetrius could not have put them into practice without the backing of Macedonian troops, and never won the hearts and minds of the Athenian people. His opponents, as we have seen, dismissed his policies as those of a blinkered cashier; in modern terms, they felt that he lacked the vision-thing. Aristotle's school, like Jowett's Balliol, could train administrators and viceroys, but could not create political leaders.

³⁸ *Pol.* 4.1–2.

6

Il Contributo dei Papiri alla Ricostruzione della Biografia e delle Idee sulla Retorica di Demetrio del Falero

Tiziano Dorandi

I. La tradizione papirologica relativa a Demetrio del Falero è costituita, quasi esclusivamente, di testimonianze conservate dai papiri di Ercolano e, in particolare, dalla *Retorica* di Filodemo.¹ Tutti i passi filodemei hanno già trovato spazio nella raccolta di Wehrli; un loro riesame, come vedremo subito, è tuttavia reso necessario dai progressi che si sono avuti sia sul piano testuale sia dal punto di vista ermeneutico.

Il numero più ampio di frammenti Wehrli ha ricondotto ai due libri Περὶ ῥητορικῆς del Falereo (F 156–59, 162, 169, 172 W = **130–132, 134, 141** SOD); uno è stato collocato nella sezione biografica (F 60 W = **37**) e uno, infine, in quella intitolata “Rhetorisches” (F 205 W = **142**).

I.1. Comincio con i luoghi della *Retorica* di Filodemo, che Wehrli assegna al Περὶ ῥητορικῆς di Demetrio. Essi contengono una interessante serie di dati sulle teorie di Demetrio concernenti la retorica

¹ Cf. T. Dorandi, *Testimonia Herculanensia*, in *CPF I 1** (Firenze: Olschki 1989) 35.

e alcuni suoi puntuali giudizi su retori o personaggi famosi: Eschine, Demostene, Isocrate, l'architetto Filone di Eleusi. Prendo in esame i singoli frammenti a partire dalla nuova silloge di Stork-van Ophuijsen-Dorandi, escludendo, per il momento, il frammento **131AB** (= F 158 e 159 W), che ci fa conoscere l'opinione di Demetrio sull'oratoria dello scolarca dell'Academia, Senocrate di Calcedonia.

a. Phld., *Rh.*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 48.1–15, vol. 1.346 Sudhaus (F 156 W = **132**)—Non ostante la nuova autopsia del papiro abbia messo in dubbio, in qualche punto, il testo costituito da Sudhaus e accettato da Wehrli,² sicuro resta il riferimento a un Filone (l. 6), che può essere identificato con l'omonimo architetto di Eleusi, vissuto nella seconda metà del IV sec.³ È probabile che Filodemo riferisse un giudizio di Demetrio sulle qualità di Filone simile a quelli che leggiamo ancora in Filodemo, Cicerone e Valerio Massimo:⁴ l'architetto Filone era capace di parlare con competenza davanti all'assemblea della costruzione dell'arsenale di Atene grazie alle sue conoscenze di architetto e non per la sua preparazione retorica.

b. Phld., *Rh. IV*, *PHerc.* 1007, col. 40a.24–42a.4, vol. 1.221–2 (F 157 W = **130**)—È, senza dubbio, il testo più significativo per la ricostruzione delle idee di Demetrio sulla retorica.⁵ Siamo alla fine del quarto libro della *Retorica* e Filodemo richiama, per criticarle, le opinioni del Falereo: Demetrio sosteneva che alle tre classi in cui si era soliti dividere la retorica—δημηγορικόν, δικανικόν e ἐπιδεικτικόν (o σοφιστικόν) γένος—se ne dovesse aggiungere una quarta, chiamata ἐντευκτικόν ἅπασιν,⁶ che avesse la possibilità di coesistere insieme con quella sofistica (o epidittica), in una stessa e unica persona.

² Una ricostruzione alternativa, più convincente, propose il von Arnim, *SVF* III Diog. F 100. La lettura del papiro è incerta soprattutto nella l. 4 (a causa di una aggiunta interlineare) e nelle ll. 9–15 (la cui ricostruzione presenta ancora difficoltà). Le nuove lezioni registrate da M. G. Cappelluzzo, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 6 (1976) 73 non sono sempre attendibili. In qualche punto la studiosa mostra eccessiva prudenza: alla l. 1 s., [Δημή]τρως di Sudhaus è integrazione che riterrei indubitabile; alla l. 5, περὶ θάτε[ρο]ν Φίλωνος è sicuro.

³ Cf. E. Fabricius, *Philon* 56, *RE* XX 1 (1941) 56–60.

⁴ Phld., *Rhet. IV*, *PHerc.* 1007, col. 11a.1–4 (vol. 1.192); Cic., *De orat.* 1.14.62 e Val. Max. 8.12 ext. 2. Cf. Wehrli *SdA* 4.79.

⁵ Cf. Wehrli, *SdA* 4.79 s. Per l'identità con Demetrio del Falero, cf. W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos* (Leipzig: Avenarius 1906; Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965) 69.

⁶ Sul suo significato, cf. J. M. van Ophuijsen, *Where Have the Topics Gone?*, in *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and D. C. Mirhady, 154–55, 169 (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers 1994).

Ribadisce che la ricerca e l'acquisizione della verità sono prerogativa non dei filosofi, ma piuttosto dei retori, i quali soli rappresentano quel tipo di oratore universale capace di tenere discorsi sia per le ἐντεύξεις sia περὶ ὁμιλίας⁷ e sulle indagini che richiedono prova (τὰς σκέψεις . . . τὰς πίστεως δεομένους).⁸ In questa pretesa che esistesse una persona che potesse riunire in sé tutti quanti i generi retorici è stato intravisto (Wehrli) un tentativo, da parte di Demetrio, di superare le antiche perduranti rivalità sul predominio della filosofia o della retorica nel campo della educazione. Forse Demetrio, nella sua posizione di uomo di Stato filosoficamente formato credeva di essere riuscito a fare di se stesso un modello vivente di tutte queste virtù.

c. Phld., *Rh. IV*, *PHerc.* 1007, col.15a.20–18a.8, vol. 1.197 (F 162 e 169 W = **134**)—Il duplice giudizio negativo di Demetrio su Demostene—troppo teatrale e non semplice né nobile nella sua oratoria e incline, inoltre, verso ciò che c'è di più molle e infimo—si incanala bene nella tradizione aristotelica⁹ secondo cui la ὑπόκρισις di un retore è certamente ignobile, ma necessaria a causa della μοχθηρία τῶν πολιτειῶν.

Nelle linee seguenti, Filodemo riferisce le critiche di Demetrio allo stile di Isocrate,¹⁰ accusato di ricorrere a periodi troppo lunghi e, pertanto, impossibili da declamare.¹¹

d. Phld., *Rh.*, *PHerc.* 1015, fr. 6.1–7, vol. 1.272 (F 172 W = **141**)—

⁷ La lettura ἀληθείας (accolta finora da tutti gli editori) è falsa. Sul papiro si legge infatti: ὁμιλίας (= ὁμιλίας). La nuova lezione sembra confermare una suggestione di Wehrli, *SdA* 4.79 che l'ἐντευκτικὸς λόγος di Demetrio "entspricht der προσομιλητικὴ τέχνη, welche im platonischen Sophistes 222 c zur δικανικὴ und δημηγορικὴ τέχνη tritt. D. greift also auf voraristotelische Unterscheidung zurück."

⁸ Approvato da Cicerone, *De off.* 1.1.3 (= F 73 W = **119**), *De leg.* 3.6.14 (= F 72 W = **57**) e *Brutus* 9.37 (= 175 W = **121**).

⁹ Arist., *Rhet.* 1403b 22ss. Cf. Wehrli *SdA* 4.80s. A col. 15a.24–25 si legge: παρὰ δ[ὲ τῶ]ι | Φαληρεῖ λέγεται ὅτι ὕπο (e non λ. τὸ), il che consente di stabilire che, nelle linee seguenti, è riportata una citazione diretta da Demetrio.

¹⁰ Cf. G. Indelli, "Testimonianze su Isocrate nel *PHerc.* 1007 (Filodemo, *Rhetorica IV*)," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 23 (1993) 88s.

¹¹ Alla base di entrambi i giudizi si colloca la distinzione aristotelica tra la γραφικὴ e la ἀγωνιστικὴ λέξις, la seconda delle quali ritenuta ὑποκριτικωτάτη (Arist. *Rhet.* 3.12, 1413b9). Cf. Wehrli, *SdA* 10.43 (Comm. a F 52). Recentemente M. Gigante, "La Scuola di Aristotele," in *Festschrift Kullmann* (Stuttgart 1997), 260–3 ha suggerito che l'intero passo filodemeo (15a.24–18a8) deve essere "riportato integralmente quale frammento unico di Demetrio e quale frammento unico di Ieronimo" (263). Wehrli avrebbe avuto torto a tagliare in tre sezioni quel brano e a distribuirlo fra Demetrio (F 162 e 169 = **134**) e Ieronimo (F 52 W).

Negli scarni resti del frammento sembra che Filodemo richiami la testimonianza di Demetrio in un'opera sulla retorica a proposito dell'attribuzione degli scritti di Pitagora al pitagorico Liside di Taranto.¹²

e. Dall'estrema lacunosità dell'ultimo passo—Phld., *Rh.*, *PHerc.* 1015, fr. 23.10–15, vol. I.278 (F 205 W = **142**)—risalta solo il nome del nostro filosofo peripatetico.

I.2. Vengo al giudizio di Demetrio sulla abilità oratoria di Senocrate. Ai due testi della *Retorica* filodemea raccolti da Wehrli—Phld., *Rh.*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 55, vol. 1.350 (F 158 W = **131A** = Senocr. F 37 Isnardi) e *PHerc.* 453, fr. 4 (F 159 W = **131B** = Senocr. F 39)—ne deve essere aggiunto un terzo, dove è, di nuovo, una allusione, seppure celata, all'opinione di Demetrio—*PHerc.* 224, fr. 12, vol. 2.173 (**131C** = Senocr. F 38 Isnardi).¹³

Una omogeneità di contenuti unisce i tre passi, nei quali è fatto esplicito riferimento all'atteggiamento tenuto da Senocrate durante l'ambasceria presso Antipatro alla fine della Guerra lamiaca, nel 322 a.C. Dalle tre testimonianze sembra che Demetrio attribuisca la cattiva accoglienza riservata da Antipatro a Senocrate alla inabilità oratoria dimostrata dal filosofo in quella occasione.¹⁴ Senocrate fallì nel suo intento perché non seppe perorare la causa ateniese come un retore, ma argomentò: “Così come era solito disputare una tesi nell'Accademia” (ὥς] εἰώθει διαπελ[ραίνεσθαι] πρὸς θέσιν ἐν 'Αλ[καδημείαι]).¹⁵ A Senocrate mancava, quindi, quel λόγος ἐντευκτικὸς ἅπασιν, che,

¹² Cf. D.L. 8.7 su cui J. Stenzel, *Lysis* 2, *RE* XIV 1 (1928) 64s. e B. Centrone, *I Pitagorici* (Roma e Bari: Laterza 1996) 148–49.

¹³ Quest'ultimo è solo parzialmente citato da Wehrli, *SdA* 4.80. I tre luoghi furono raccolti e studiati, per la prima volta, da Crönert 1906, 67–69. Cf. M. Isnardi Parente, “Per la biografia di Senocrate,” *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 109 (1981) 136–37, 150ss. e nel comm. ai F 37–39 di Senocrate (Napoli: Bibliopolis 1981) 296–99; D. Whitehead, “Xenokrates the Metic,” *RM* 124 (1981) 238–41; K. Gaiser, *Philodems Academica. Die Berichte über Platon und die Alte Akademie in zwei herkulanensischen Papyri* (Stuttgart e Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog 1988) 471s. Sul giudizio di Demetrio su Senocrate vedi ora T. Dorandi, “Senocrate nel giudizio di Demetrio del Falero,” in *Festschrift Kullmann* 1997, 271–8.

¹⁴ Non ostante permangano ancora alcune difficoltà testuali, dovute alla cattiva trasmissione dei frammenti, il loro significato è abbastanza chiaro. Una rinnovata autopsia del papiro migliora alcuni punti almeno del **131A**. Nel **131B** i dubbi sollevati dal Crönert (1906, 68) restano irrisolti.

¹⁵ *PHerc.* 224 fr. 12.6–8 Crönert (= **131C**). L'integrazione può essere considerata sicura.

abbiamo visto,¹⁶ Demetrio considerava necessario per perorare una causa davanti a un potente e che lui stesso sosteneva di aver mostrato davanti alla ὑπερηφανία di Cratero.¹⁷

Piú in generale, il giudizio di Demetrio è interessante per la ricostruzione delle vicende biografiche di Senocrate intorno alle quali circolavano due filoni: il primo, favorevole allo scolarca, ne mette in luce la fermezza di fronte al sovrano macedone, il secondo, sfavorevole, insiste sulla sua inefficacia. Per quel che riguarda l'episodio dell'ambasceria di Senocrate presso Antipatro, sembra che Demetrio sia interessato a contrapporre una sua versione "negativa" dei fatti a quella "patriottica," quale risulta dall'*Academicorum historia* di Filodemo, da Plutarco e Diogene Laerzio.¹⁸ Nel tendenzioso e inaffidabile resoconto di Demetrio è implicito un motivo antiacademico a favore della filosofia aristotelica, che permette piú elevate prestazioni di ordine pratico-politico (Isnardi). Per quanto riguarda la testimonianza degli altri autori, studi recenti hanno dimostrato che Filodemo e Plutarco sono piú attendibili di Diogene Laerzio e che il contenuto della narrazione di Plutarco, sebbene appaia piú ricco di dettagli di quello di Filodemo, rimane invariato nella sostanza. Plutarco informa che Senocrate era stato aggiunto alla delegazione ateniese su delibera popolare grazie alle sue qualità morali e che Antipatro lo aveva accolto con ostilità e ben presto gli aveva ingiunto di tacere. Simile in Filodemo e in Plutarco la risposta che il filosofo aveva dato a Antipatro riguardo alle decisioni che aveva prese nei confronti di Atene: moderate per schiavi, ma dure per uomini liberi.¹⁹

Il problema dell'identificazione dell'opera di Demetrio dalla quale Filodemo avrebbe ripreso il giudizio sfavorevole su Senocrate continua a essere controverso. A quanto sembra, Filodemo citava la sua fonte nelle ll. 14–16 della col. 55 del *PHerc.* 1004 (F 158 W = **131A**). Purtroppo, le cattive condizioni del papiro ne rendono quanto mai dubbia la lettura e la conseguente interpretazione: sul papiro si scorgono solo minime tracce; non resta quindi che affidarsi alle lezioni dell'Apografo Napoletano (N):]Π[...]ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥC | [ca. 11 lettere]ΩΙΗΟ|. Sudhaus integrò: καθά]π[ερ ὁ] Φαληρεὺς | [ἱστορήκεν

¹⁶ *Supra*, I.1b.

¹⁷ Cf. Demetr. *De eloc.* 289 (= F 183 W = 12).

¹⁸ Phld. *Acad. hist.*, col. 7.19–8.17; Plut. *Phoc.* 27.1–6 (= Senocr. F 35); D.L. 4.9.

¹⁹ Sulla tradizione relativa alla ambasceria di Senocrate, cf. i riferimenti biografici a Isnardi 1981, Whithead 1981 e Dorandi 1997, 276–7.

ἐν τ]ῶι [περὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς.²⁰ Crönert proponeva:²¹ καθά]π[ερ ὁ] Φαληρεὺς ἰ σο[φιστῆς ἐν τ]ῶι πολ[λιτικῶι φησι, richiamando il titolo Περὶ πολιτικῶν αβ (D.L. 5.80), ma dichiarando onestamente che altre integrazioni sono possibili.²² La Isnardi²³ non esclude, invece, un riferimento alle Συναγωγὰι δημηγοριῶν καὶ πρεσβειῶν ricordate ancora da Diogene Laerzio nel catalogo delle opere di Demetrio. Pure interessante, questo suggerimento non trova conferma nelle tracce superstiti della tradizione.

I.3. Nell'ultimo luogo della *Retorica* (F 60 W = **37**) Filodemo,²⁴ per dimostrare come nei dominati più che nelle democrazie i sudditi sono ammirati se possiedono determinate virtù, cita l'esempio dell'atteggiamento assunto da Filippo II di Macedonia nei confronti di Pitone²⁵ e da Tolemeo I verso Demetrio del Falero. Il retroscena riporta, senza dubbio, al soggiorno di Demetrio alla Corte di Tolemeo I Soter a Alessandria d'Egitto, dopo la morte di Cassandro, a partire dal 298/7.²⁶

I.4. Queste testimonianze sui non buoni rapporti fra Demetrio e Senocrate mettono ulteriormente in dubbio la notizia di Mironiano di Amastri riportata da Diogene Laerzio²⁷ che Demetrio avrebbe acquistato Senocrate venduto schiavo perché non era in grado di pagare la tassa dei meteci (μετοίκιον): con il suo intervento, Demetrio avrebbe restituito la libertà al filosofo e pagato lui stesso la tassa. Più verisimile risulta, in effetti, la versione dell'episodio tramandata dallo pseudo-Plutarco e da Plutarco,²⁸ secondo cui fu Licurgo a svolgere quel ruolo nei confronti di Senocrate. Quell'atto di rispetto verso il filosofo accademico e l'intervento giuridico a suo favore si comprendono meglio se riferiti a Licurgo, una cui appartenenza all'Accademia pare accertata. Licurgo aveva potuto agire probabilmente in qualità di preposto ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει τῶν χρημάτων (carica tenuta all'incirca dal 338/7 al 327/6),

²⁰ Ne accettano il testo Wehrli e Isnardi.

²¹ Crönert 1906, 68 e n. 332. Lo studioso dichiara di aver letto σο di σο[φιστῆς sul papiro.

²² F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIB 653 giudica l'integrazione non solo incerta, ma inverisimile in quanto si richiederebbe piuttosto qualcosa come: ἐν α' (β') τῶ(ν) πολ[λιτικῶν.

²³ Isnardi 1981, 137 n. 1 e *Ead.*, *Senocrate* 1981, 298.

²⁴ Phld., *Rh.*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 101, vol. 1.377 (F 60 W = **37**).

²⁵ Pitone di Ainos, discepolo di Platone, o Pitone di Bisanzio, discepolo di Isocrate?

²⁶ Cf. J.-P. Schneider, *Démétrios de Phalère*, in *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques* 2, ed. R. Goulet, 630 (Paris: CNRS 1994).

²⁷ D.L. 4.14.

²⁸ Ps.-Plut. *X orat. vitae* 842b = Senocr. F 14 e Plut. *Tit. Flam.* 12.7 = F 15.

durante i primi anni, dunque, dello scolarcato di Senocrate. Non importa qui stabilire in che cosa consistesse concretamente l'intervento di Licurgo: se si fosse trattato di una esenzione permanente dalla tassa di meteco, egli avrebbe dovuto richiedere per Senocrate un atto di ἀτέλεια τοῦ μετοικίου o di ἰσοτέλεια.²⁹ In ogni modo, resta, pur sempre, significativo il fatto che una parte almeno della tradizione abbia cercato, a un determinato momento, di conciliare Demetrio e Senocrate. Un fatto questo, che può trovare una plausibile giustificazione nel dato storico della persecuzione cui l'Academia e il Peripato andarono soggetti durante la restaurazione democratica del Poliorcete.³⁰

I.5. La presenza di Demetrio nei papiri egiziani è più limitata. In un frammento di un papiro di Lille si legge:³¹ Callistene e Demetrio, sebbene eccellenti retori, non riuscirono a evitare di cadere in disgrazia nei loro rapporti rispettivamente con Alessandro Magno e Tolemeo II Filadelfo. Il riferimento è, senza dubbio, allo stato di prigionia imposto da Tolemeo II a Demetrio, che aveva tentato invano di persuadere Tolemeo I a designare come suoi successori i figli avuti da Euridice, mentre il sovrano aveva preferito il figlio natogli da Berenice, Tolemeo II.³²

I.6. Un altro frammento della Collezione dei papiri dell'Istituto "G. Vitelli" di Firenze, ancora inedito, presentato dal Professore Manfredi al XXI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia a Berlino nell'agosto 1995 (*PSI Inv. CNR 70*) contiene probabilmente resti di un'opera, altrimenti inattestata, di Demetrio del Falero.³³ In quella che si presume sia la sottoscrizione del rotolo leggiamo con sicurezza un titolo: Δημητρίου ὑπὲρ ἐλέου. Un *dicolon* dopo ἐλέου conferma che la parola finiva lí e che lo scritto aveva come oggetto una trattazione della "compassione." Le poche parole conservate sembrano riportare a un contesto politico: vi si scorgono, infatti, riferimenti alla tirannide e a tiranni e al nome di Pisistrato. L'attribuzione di un'opera ὑπὲρ ἐλέου a Demetrio del Falero, ancora incerta, non parrebbe impossibile, tenuto

²⁹ Cf. Isnardi 1981, 46 n. 41, 279s., 284s. e *Ead.*, *Biografia* 1981, 144–45; Whitehead 1981, 235–38.

³⁰ Cf. I. Düring, *Herodicus the Crateteian* (Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand 1941) 84ss., le cui conclusioni sono condivise dalla Isnardi 1981, 46 n. 41.

³¹ *PLille 88* riproposto da A. Linguiti, *CPF I 1*** (Firenze: Olschki 1992) 3–5: 42 1T (= 41).

³² Cf. D.L. 5.78–79 (= F 69 W = 1).

³³ Ringrazio il Professore M. Manfredi per avermi permesso di dare notizia del nuovo testo anche in occasione del Convegno di Boulder.

anche conto delle sue vicende biografiche, ma soltanto la pubblicazione del frustulo potrà dissolvere i dubbi e consentire eventuali ulteriori progressi.

I.7. Resterebbe qualcosa da dire a proposito del *PSI* 2.144³⁴ che conserva forse resti di una epitome dell'opera περὶ ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας di Eratostene di Cirene (il cui nome è citato alla l. 8).³⁵ Sul papiro si legge un aspro giudizio su talune eccentricità del modo di porgere (ὑπόκρισις) di Demostene rimproverato di esser balbuziente e di muovere la spalla in modo effeminato, vizi che avrebbe corretto grazie a un costante esercizio. L'autorità di Eratostene viene richiamata a proposito di un giuramento in versi peculiare di Demostene e di alcuni suoi difetti di pronuncia. Le critiche sono le stesse mosse da Demetrio a Demostene di essere oratore di categoria inferiore perché ἐπιμελής μᾶλλον ἢ εὐφυής: incapace di improvvisare e abile solo a tenere discorsi già scritti.³⁶ Sebbene il nome di Demetrio non compaia nella parte conservata del frammento, parrebbe plausibile supporre che fosse stato citato nelle linee precedenti, ora perdute.³⁷ Tutte queste notizie risalirebbero, pertanto, a Demetrio, anche se indirettamente. Il papiro conserverebbe, dunque, una epitome di uno scritto di Eratostene che, a sua volta, avrebbe epitomato Demetrio. Fonte ultima di Demetrio sarebbe stata, infine, una commedia.³⁸

II. Questi in un breve sommario di conclusioni i risultati della mia indagine sulla tradizione papirologica di Demetrio del Falero. Per quanto riguarda questo autore, se si escludono il frammento fiorentino inedito, la cui paternità demetriaca pare accertata, e il *PSI* 2.144, non ci sono novità sorprendenti, nel senso che i papiri non hanno incrementato il numero dei testi nella silloge di Wehrli. Il Papiro di Lille 88, infatti, non aggiunge niente a quanto già conosceamo. Qualche progresso di

³⁴ Pubblicato, per la prima volta, da G. Vitelli, *PSI* 2 (Firenze, Ariani 1913) 69–71 e riproposto da I. Gallo, *Frammenti biografici da papiri, I: La biografia politica* (Roma: Ateneo 1975) 141–61 (con la tav. VI). Ora **135C**.

³⁵ Riferisco, in maniera molto sommaria, i risultati raggiunti da C. Cooper, "The Tradition of Demosthenes' Speech Impediment," (articolo ancora inedito, una cui copia ha circolato a Boulder). Per Eratostene, cf. H.-G. Nesselrath, *Die attische Mittlere Komödie* (Berlin e New York 1990) 176–80.

³⁶ Plut. *Demosth.* 9.3 (= F 163W= **135A**); Phot. *Bibl.* 493a 41 (F 164 W= **135B**) e ps.-Plut. *X orat. vitae* 845a (non raccolto da Wehrli né da SOD).

³⁷ Gallo 1975, 156.

³⁸ Queste le conclusioni cui giunge Cooper (citato alla n. 35).

ordine testuale deriva, invece, dalla autopsia dei singoli passi, conservati, nella loro totalità, dai Papiri di Ercolano. Novità si registrano anche nella ricostruzione degli eventi sottesi ai giudizi espressi da Demetrio su Senocrate.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

7

Demetrius of Phalerum on Literature*

Franco Montanari

Relatively little is known of Demetrius of Phalerum's writings on literature, reflecting his interest in literary works and the personalities of poets and writers,¹ even less than is known concerning his production in other fields of learning, such as philosophy, historical-political studies, oratory or rhetoric. Diogenes Laertius states that he outstripped all the Peripatetics of his day in quantity of books and number of lines, for he was highly educated and rich in experience in a multitude of fields: he composed historical and political works, essays on poets and treatises on rhetoric, made collections of public and diplomatic speeches, compilations of Aesop's fables, and much else.²

In addition to the generic information concerning Demetrius of Phalerum's *writings on poets* (τὰ περὶ ποιητῶν), Diogenes Laertius also provides us with a few titles. On Homer we have a Περὶ Ἰλιάδος in two

* English translation by Rachel Barritt.

¹ Tertullian, *Apolog.* 18, defines him as "grammaticorum tunc probatissimus" (62 SOD = fr. 188 W [*Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, hrsg. v. F. Wehrli: 4. *Demetrios von Phaleron*, 2nd ed. (Basel and Stuttgart 1968)] = 228 T 10 FGrH); "grammaticus" is the definition given also by Marius Victorinus, *Ars Gramm.* I 4 = 147 = fr. 196 W.

² DL 5.80–81 = 1.58–109 = fr. 74 (+189) W = 228 T 1 FGrH.

books, a *Περὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας* in three books, a *Ὀμηρικός* in one book.³ We are also told of a *Περὶ Ἀντιφάνους* in one book, on the subject of Antiphanes, an eminent poet of the Middle Comedy who was active in the first half of the fourth century.⁴ It is interesting to note that this book concerned an author who was fairly close in time to Demetrius of Phalerum (Antiphanes may have been perhaps a couple of generations older, or thereabouts), but unfortunately no fragment at all has come down to us.⁵ As far as the poets are concerned, nothing else remains: Homeric criticism represents the only setting from which one can hope to derive some results. We will return to this later.

One difficulty consists of attribution problems, due to the fact that our sources sometimes simply quote the name “Demetrios” without specification, in a situation in which homonymy is far from rare. In the history of the editions of Demetrius of Phalerum fragments, this type of uncertainty has given rise to a number of oscillations, some of which are quite curious. The old Ostermann collection⁶ was rather generous and included many citations which were later attributed to other figures bearing the name “Demetrios.” Jacoby, on the other hand, openly declared he would not include all the fragments allowed by Ostermann,⁷ although the exclusion criterion he adopted is not altogether clear. In FGrH 228

³ 143–6 = frr. 190–93 W: see below.

⁴ 1.102 = fr. 194 W = Antiphanes T 5 PCG. A *syngramma* was devoted to Antiphanes also by Dorotheus of Ascalon, a grammarian of the first imperial age: Athen. 14.662f = Antiphanes T 7 PCG; for Aristophanes of Byzantium v. fr. 369 Slater = Antiphanes T 6 PCG.

⁵ Wehrli *ad loc.*, 86, hypothesizes: “dann stammt von D. vielleicht ein Teil des Materials bei Suda s.v. und im Anonymus De comoedia 13 p. 9 Kaibel.” I venture to propose a very hazardous suggestion, not to be taken seriously. Plutarch (*Demosth.* 9.3–4 = 135A = fr. 163 W) and Photius (*Bibl.* 493a41 = 135B = fr. 164 W) report that Demetrius of Phalerum says that once Demosthenes, as if under inspiration, swore the famous metrical oath “by land, by springs, by rivers, by floods” and so he caused an uproar in the assembly and that the episode was ridiculed by the comic poets. Now, ps.-Plutarch (*Vitae dec. orat.* 845b) tells that the comic poets Antiphanes and Timocles made fun of Demosthenes in their comedies and then quotes the same oath, adding that in this way Demosthenes caused an uproar in the assembly. No explicit connection is stated, but perhaps it is possible to imagine that the point regarding Demetrius of Phalerum about Demosthenes could be traced back to his book about Antiphanes and originated from a comment or an analysis of a comedy of Antiphanes dealing with Demosthenes.

⁶ Chr. Ostermann, *Commentatio de Demetrii Phalerei vita, rebus gestis et scriptorum reliquiis* (Progr. Hersfeld 1847; Fulda 1857).

⁷ FGrH 228, II B Komm., 641: “Ostermann ... mit bisher vollständigster sammlung der fragmente, die hier nicht alle aufgenommen sind (s.u. p. 648, 32).”

Komm. he states:⁸ “nicht aufgenommen sind außer den dürftigen überresten von reden (o. p. 643, 44; 645, 19) und den Χρεῖαι (o. p. 644, 26) eine reihe von zitatēn in den Homerscholien (*Il.* Z 414; Ξ 221; Ν 5; Π 411; Eust. *Il.* O 680; Schol. *Od.* σ 17; Athen. V 4 p. 177 EF), die apophthegmata... .” The same considerations are found in Wehrli, in the introductory comment to the fragments of “philological” works (85): “Demetrios allein bedeutet in Zitaten besonders für grammatikalische Fragen wahrscheinlich den Aristarcheer D. Ixion (Ostermann fr. 58-62; cf. Martini 2835, 20⁹; Bayer 140¹⁰: es handelt sich um die Scholien zu Homer Z 414; Ν 5; Ξ 221; Π 411; Eustath. zu O 680; schol. σ 17).” However, in this list Wehrli stops at sch. *Od.* σ 17, since in his edition he naturally does not omit the certain fragment found in Athen. V 177 ef, as we will see shortly (actually **143** = fr. 190 Wehrli).

Examining this series, one finds that in sch. *Il.* 6.414, 13.5, 14.221, 16.411 and *Od.* 18.17 there is a citation of a “Demetrios” without specification: these fragments have been attributed to the grammarian Demetrius Ixion (whose name recurs in another twenty or so cases in Homer Scholia, where he is cited also as Δημήτριος ὁ Ἰξίων or only ὁ Ἰξίων).¹¹ In contrast, the citation of “Demetrios” in Eustathius’ commentary *ad Il.* 15.680 (1037.57) = **174** certainly belongs to the grammarian Demetrius Gonypesós, as confirmed by the parallel sch. ex. *Il.* 15.683–84, in which he is cited with his full name (as in the other two extant fragments of Demetrius Gonypesós).¹² Therefore as far as these six fragments are concerned, Jacoby’s omission (in contrast to Ostermann’s inclusion) would appear to have been guided by uncertainty in the attribution and perhaps even by awareness of the different authorship possibilities.

Consequently, it comes as something of a surprise to note the omission in Jacoby’s collection of the fragment preserved by Athenaeus

⁸ II B Komm., 648, 32ff.

⁹ E. Martini, *Demetrios* 85, in *RE* IV 2 (1901) 2817ff.

¹⁰ E. Bayer, “Demetrius Phalereus der Athener,” *Tübinger Beiträge z. Altertumsw.* 36 (1942).

¹¹ The cases in question are respectively fr. 7 = 48, 14, 15, 18, 25 in T. Staesche, *De Demetrio Ixione grammatico* (Halis Sax. 1883) = **170, 172, 171, 173, 175**; one can also add sch. *Il.* 15.194, quoting “Demetrios” = fr. 17 Staesche. In Scholia and other erudite sources “Demetrios” without specification is likely to be Demetrius Ixion, of course, particularly concerning grammatical and philological questions: cf. also Wehrli, quoted above.

¹² Cf. M. van der Valk ad Eust. l.c.; Erbse ad sch. *Il.* cit.

book V, 177 ef, which is certainly a Demetrius of Phalerum fragment, accompanied as it is by the complete citation of the name Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς (**143** = fr. 190 W, see below). If one surmises that Jacoby omitted it on account of the type of its “philological” content, then one may wonder why he included sch. *Od.* 3.267 + Tzetzes *Prol. ad Lycophr.* 4.5ff. (FGrH 228 F 32a–b = **144**, **146** = frr. 191–192 W) and Stobaeus 3.5.43 (FGrH 228 F 33 = **145** = fr. 193 W), to which we will turn shortly: the claim that the latter two exemplify contents that are partly of a historical-cultural nature, in addition to observations on literary interpretation, is not a valid explanation, since a similar claim could easily be made regarding the above-mentioned Athenaeus fragment. In actual fact, these three (or four) certain fragments, i.e. with the complete name Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς, form the entire stock of Homeric interpretation of Demetrius on which considerations can be made. This group of fragments will be dealt with in depth later.

Another problem is that of sch. AD *ad Il.* 6.35, in which a “Demetrios” is cited. Jacoby includes this scholium in the *Zweifelhaftes und Unechtes* section of Demetrius of Phalerum fragments (FGrH 228 F 50 = **157**), and he comments telegraphically: “zitate D.s in den Homer-scholien o. p. 648, 34.” In other words, he refers back to none other than the place seen above, in which he lists the citations from Homer Scholia he had omitted in his collection: but this one, also bearing only the name “Demetrios,” is indeed present, albeit in the *Zweifelhaftes und Unechtes* section. The same situation is found in Wehrli’s edition, where the fragment is included in the section headed *Unbestimmbares, Zweifelhaftes, Unechtes*, numbered 207 = **157**, and the comment says nothing at all about its authorship. This is a Homeric scholium of the D class, one of the well-known mythographical ἱστορίαι of the so-called Mythographus Homericus,¹³ which tells of the conquest of the city of Pedasos by Achilles. The subscription says ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Δημητρίῳ καὶ Ἡσιόδῳ: the ‘Demetrios’ cited here has been identified elsewhere with Demetrius of Scepsis and therefore the scholium has been included in the collection of fragments of the latter.¹⁴ Statements in favour of Demetrius of Scepsis can also be found by

¹³ F. Montanari, “The Mythographus Homericus,” *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle. A Collection of Papers in Honour of D. M. Schenkeveld* (Amsterdam: University Press, 1995) 135–72, with bibliography.

¹⁴ R. Gaede, *Demetrii Scepsii quae supersunt* (Diss. Gryphiswaldae 1880) fr. 32.

Merkelbach-West in the edition of Hesiod fragments (fr. 214). In addition, Erbse (who did not include the D-Scholia in his edition of the Scholia to the *Iliad*) reports the two attributions without committing himself in any direction.

But perhaps something a little more definite can be said concerning this fragment. We do not yet have a modern critical edition of the *Scholia D in Iliadem* and for these Scholia the text of the 1517 *editio princeps* by Janus Lascaris is used, while the Dindorf edition of the *Scholia A in Iliadem* can be used for the D-Scholia extracts contained in the codex Ven. A. As mentioned above, Erbse did not include the D class in his edition and merely gave an indication whenever a D-Scholium happened to be present in codex A (as is the case here, and so it is labelled as a sch. AD). It is known, perhaps, that I have long been working on an edition of the *Scholia D in Iliadem*. I have found that in the most authoritative manuscript of these scholia, the codex C partly preserved in Rome and partly in Madrid (dated between the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century),¹⁵ the subscription of the ἱστορία in question is different from that given in the AHRV codices.

ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Δημητρίῳ καὶ Ἑσιόδῳ	ARV
ἱστορεῖ Δημήτριος καὶ Ἑσιόδος	H
ἱστορεῖ Δημήτριος ὁ ἄσκητης†	C

I would argue that the blatant corruption of C masks the correct original subscription ἱστορεῖ Δημήτριος ὁ Σκήψιος. In addition I also suspect that the name of Hesiod could be the fruit of a conjecture¹⁶ intended to amend the corrupted ἄσκητης, but this is perhaps casting my net too far. A good parallel for the Δημήτριος ὁ Σκήψιος solution in sch. *Il.* 6.35 is offered by the subscription of the D-Scholium to *Il.* 20.3 in the manuscripts: ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Δημητρίῳ τῷ Σκηψίῳ, confirmed by a parchment fragment, *P. Schubart* 21, of the fifth century A.D. (the alternation between the formula ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ + dative or ἱστορεῖ + nominative does not constitute a problem).¹⁷ If these considerations are acceptable,

¹⁵ Cf. F. Montanari, *Studi di filologia omerica antica I* (Pisa: Giardini, 1979) passim; *Studi di filologia omerica antica II* (Pisa: Giardini, 1995) partic. 147ff.

¹⁶ Doubts on the Hesiodic contents of the sch. also in Merkelbach-West, apparatus to the fr. 214.

¹⁷ Cf. Montanari, "Myth Hom." 1995 (see note 13). To my knowledge, *Il.* 6.35 and 20.3 contain the only two citations of a "Demetrios" of the *Scholia D in Iliadem* as they have been edited (Lascaris) and in both cases the citation is Δημήτριος ὁ Σκήψιος. Another two can be derived from the manuscripts, with the bare "Demetrios," that is

then sch. AD *ad Il.* 6.35 has to be regarded as indeed containing a remnant of Demetrius of Scepsis and definitely not of Demetrius of Phalerum.

Quite different is the case of the citation in Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Κορώπη, where it would appear that a *hypomnema* to Nicander is attributed precisely to Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς. Wehrli includes the fragment in his section *Unbestimmbares, Zweifelhaftes, Unechtes*, listing it as Nr. 208 = **158** and specifying in the comment that a *hypomnema* by Demetrius of Phalerum to Nicander "ist chronologisch unmöglich; mit Recht nimmt man an, daß der Phalereer mit Demetrios Chloros verwechselt wird."¹⁸ Jacoby, on the other hand, omits the fragment altogether: a somewhat bizarre editorial choice, as the presence of the full name would certainly suggest it should be included among the *spuria* with an *ad hoc* explanation (see Jacoby himself for 228 F 51 = **65** and 52 = **66**). That the reference of Stephanus of Byzantium is to Demetrios Chloros (cited elsewhere in the Nicander Scholia) is in my view virtually certain, and in any case there can hardly be any doubt that Demetrius of Phalerum is to be ruled out here: but, I believe, the presence of the full name needs to be mentioned and discussed in a collection of Demetrius of Phalerum fragments.

This is an isolated example in which the authenticity of a fragment that has come down to us in a text presenting the citation of the full name of Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς has to be rejected. Problems often arise elsewhere from the fact that, as mentioned earlier, one sometimes finds citation of a "Demetrios" without specification. This problem is compounded by the existence of several homonyms, especially when dealing with scholiographic, lexicographic and other erudite sources.

Before going further into this matter, I would like to make a remark concerning what we have considered so far. Discussion has centered on a fairly limited number of examples, but has concretely confirmed what I believe to be a fairly widespread opinion, namely that we sorely lack a reliable edition of the fragments of Demetrius of Phalerum and that it is extremely desirable to have a new edition based on serious re-examina-

sch. D *Il.* 5.906 and 6.23: the first may be Demetrius Ixion according to Erbse *ad loc.*, the second could be Demetrius of Scepsis.

¹⁸ Cf. F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1891–92; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965) II:20; W. Kroll, *Nikandros* 11, in *RE* XVII 1 (1936) 262; C. Guhl, *Die Fragmente des Alexandrinischen Grammatikers Theon* (Diss. Hamburg 1969) 4.

tion of the evidence. I am far from convinced that the editions currently available—I mean, editions of various figures named “Demetrios”—have provided the best or the most plausible solution in all the cases in which the sources exhibit the citation of a “Demetrios” without any specification.¹⁹ It should not be overlooked that new editions, above all of scholiographic and lexicographic works, may well lead to notable progress in this field. However, this is a problem that goes beyond the scope of my paper.

The observations made so far have been concerned with criticism of poetry: we will investigate Homeric criticism in greater depth, but it is appropriate at this point to offer a few words on prose writers first. The Demetrius fragments concerning prose works are normally set in the framework of rhetorical or rhetorical-philosophical production. However when treatises on rhetoric make direct use of authors’ works, with detailed close stylistic analysis, it is clear that such treatises are in some sense grounded on interpretation of the texts. This means that they have a close relationship with hermeneutic and literary criticism, and it is certainly true that there are naturally overlapping areas and shared materials between these disciplines. Let us examine one case regarding Plato.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in *de Demosth.* 5, severely criticizes Plato’s use of the high style. When Plato indulges in sophisticated stylistic refinements and fine flourishes of phrase, Dionysius argues, he reveals a number of flaws. Dionysius lists a number of criticisms and concludes by claiming that Plato makes excessive and clumsy use of allegory, unpleasant figures of speech and Gorgianic expressions introduced in an inappropriate and puerile manner, to the point of appearing as some kind of possessed mystic, as maintained by Demetrius of Phalerum and many others as well (133 = fr. 170 W = 228 F 11b FGrH).

1. ἡ δὲ δὴ Πλατωνικὴ διάλεκτος βούλεται μὲν εἶναι καὶ αὐτὴ μῖγμα ἑκατέρων τῶν χαρακτήρων, τοῦ δὲ ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἰσχυροῦ, καθάπερ εἴρηται μοι πρότερον, πέφυκε δ’ οὐχ ὁμοίως πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς χαρακτήρας εὐτυχής. 2. ὅταν μὲν οὖν τὴν ἰσχνὴν καὶ ἀφελῇ καὶ ἀποίητον ἐπιτηδεύῃ φράσιν, ἐκτόπως ἡδεΐά ἐστι καὶ φιλάνθρωπος· καθαρὰ γὰρ ἀποχρώντως γίνεται καὶ διαυγής ... 4. ... ὅταν δὲ εἰς τὴν περιττολογίαν καὶ τὸ καλλιπεῖν, ὃ πολλάκις εἴωθε ποιεῖν, ἄμετρον ὁρμὴν λάβῃ, πολλῶ χείρων ἑαυτῆς γίνεται ... 6. ἀλληγορίας τε περιβάλλεται πολλὰς (καὶ μακράς), οὔτε μέτρον ἔχουσας οὔτε καιρόν. σχήμασί τε ποιητικοῖς ἐσχάτην

¹⁹ For ex. quotations of “Demetrios” in Aristophanes Scholia, which are attributed to Demetrius of Scepsis.

προσβάλλουσιν ἀηδίαν καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς Γοργιεῖοις ἀκαίρως καὶ μεираκιωδῶς ἐναβρύνεται. καὶ ὥπολὺς ὁ τελετὴς ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις παρ' αὐτῶν, ὡς καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς εἴρηκε που καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοί· οὐ γὰρ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος.

Attacked for his biting criticism of Plato, Dionysius then replied in self-defense with the *Letter to Pompey Geminus*, in which he also endeavoured to correct his position: in this second work Dionysius quotes his own *de Demosth.* passage containing criticisms of Plato's style together with the citation of Demetrius of Phalerum. Shortly prior to this self-quotation, Dionysius (*Epist. ad Pomp.* 1.16 = **133** = fr. 195 W = 228 F 11a FGrH) defends himself by arguing that many others before him had voiced criticism of Plato's ideas and mode of expression, starting with his most important disciple Aristotle and subsequently Cephisodorus, Theopompus, Zoilus, Hippodamas, Demetrius (of Phalerum) and many others, all of them not motivated by envy or mean-spiritedness, but simply in search of the truth.

καὶ γὰρ τὰ δόγματα διέβαλον αὐτοῦ τινες καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἐμέμψατο πρῶτον μὲν ὁ γνησιώτατος αὐτοῦ μαθητὴς Ἀριστοτέλης, ἔπειτα οἱ περὶ Κηφισόδωρόν τε καὶ Θεόπομπον καὶ Ζώϊλον καὶ Ἰπποδάμαντα καὶ Δημήτριον καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοί, οὐ διὰ φθόνον ἢ διὰ φιλαπεχθημοσύνην κωμωδοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξετάζοντες.

Commenting on the first passage (*de Demosth.* 5.6 = **133** = fr. 170), Wehrli then refers to the second (*Epist. ad Pomp.* 1.16 = **133** = fr. 195) defining it as "inhaltliche Kritik," perhaps on account of the sentence ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξετάζοντες. In my opinion, a reading of the entire passage of the *Letter to Pompey* 1–2 together with *de Demosth.* 5 shows the two passages to be so closely interconnected that it was definitely not advisable to divide them and consider them separately, classifying the first (fr. 170) under the heading *Rhetorisches* and the second (fr. 195) under the heading *Über Platon*. Jacoby achieves better results by grouping them as F 11 a–b = **133**.

Demetrius of Phalerum is adduced by Dionysius of Halicarnassus as a precedent for criticism of Plato²⁰ and it is highly plausible to suggest that Dionysius of Halicarnassus may also have used Demetrius of

²⁰ Cf. Wehrli on fr. 170 for parallels of criticism of Plato's use of the high style in Peripatetic circles, from Aristotle to Dicaearchus (see fr. 42 W, from DL 3.38 [*Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, 2nd ed., hrsg. v. F. Wehrli: 2. *Dikaiarchos*, Basel and Stuttgart 1967]).

Phalerum as a source for some of his own arguments. The catalogue of Diogenes Laertius mentions no work by Demetrius of Phalerum on Plato and it may perhaps be said that hypothesizing a specific work *Περὶ Πλάτωνος* or some such title is unnecessary. Where Demetrius of Phalerum is cited in isolation (i.e. in *de Demosth.* 5, reproduced in *Letter to Pompey* 2 = **133** = fr. 170), the content of the citation is stylistic-rhetorical, while in the other case (*Epist. ad Pomp.* 1.16 = **133** = fr. 195) his name is included within a group of figures jointly described as critics of Plato's doctrines and dialogues. If Demetrius of Phalerum criticized Plato also or predominantly on the grounds of style, this may have been encompassed within a work on rhetoric extending to much broader horizons, even in the *Περὶ ῥητορικῆς*. In any case, this is exactly what we could regard as fragments of "literary criticism" concerning prose writers.

It will have become clear from what we have seen so far that the theme of "Demetrius of Phalerum on Poetry" seems in fact to be restricted to "Demetrius of Phalerum on Homer." It is indeed the case that Homeric criticism is the area in which we have a small number of pieces of definite evidence, which allow us to achieve results. As I pointed out earlier, Diogenes Laertius provides us with three titles concerning Homeric issues: *Περὶ Ἰλιάδος* in two books, *Περὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας* in three books, *Ὀμηρικός* in one book. While the first two fit perfectly into the well-known typology of peripatetic *Περὶ-Literature* or *Problemata-Literatur*, the third could have been a speech²¹ or, perhaps more likely, a dialogue, although this by no means excludes the possibility that it may have contained exegetic reflections on passages from the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. However the evidence that has come down to us never contains any indication of the work from which the fragments came.

Let us begin by examining the fragment in Athenaeus, *Deipn.* V 177 e–f, which concerns *Iliad* 2.409 (**143** = fr. 190 W; omittit Jacoby, FGrH 228). It occurs in the context of a discussion on the *symposia* and above all on who should be invited to attend. Athenaeus says that Homer also gives indications as to which persons do not require any invitation but instead come to a feast on their own initiative. An example is given from the chieftain's dinner arranged by Agamemnon after testing the army's morale in *Iliad* book 2: Homer says (2.404–7) that Agamemnon invited

²¹ Cf. Wehrli, comm., 85: "eine rhetorische Deklamation wie Dion von Prusa oratio LIII, denn solche Reden über Homer sind alte Uebung."

the Achean princes, and he mentions Nestor, Idomeneus, the two Aiaxes, Diomedes, Odysseus. He then adds (2.408) that Menelaus came αὐτόματος, of his own accord. Athenaeus comments: "For it is plain that neither a brother, nor parents, nor wife need be invited, nor anyone else whom one holds in equal esteem with these: otherwise it would be cold and unfriendly. And yet some authorities have added a verse which further explains the reason: "for he knew in his heart that his brother was troubled" [v. 409]—as though it were necessary to tell the reason why a brother might come to dinner of his own accord..."²² (177 c). After a prolonged explanation of the absurdity of adding l. 409 to introduce a non-existent motivation, Athenaeus continues with an illustration of the opinions of the grammarian Athenocles of Cyzicus and those of Demetrius of Phalerum:

Ἀθηνοκλῆς δ' ὁ Κυζικηνὸς μᾶλλον Ἀριστάρχου κατακούων τῶν Ὀμηρικῶν ἐπῶν εὐπαιδευτότερον ἡμῖν φησι τοῦτον Ὅμηρον καταλιπεῖν, ὅσῳ τῆς ἀνάγκης ὁ Μενέλεως οἰκειοτέρως εἶχεν. Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐπαρίστανται τὴν τοῦ στίχου παράληψιν ἐπειπὼν καὶ τῆς ποιήσεως ἄλλοτρίαν, τὸν

ἦδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφεὸν ὥς ἐπονείτο (B 409)

μικρολογίαν ἐμβάλλειν τοῖς ἡθεσιν. "οἶμαι γάρ, φησὶν, ἕκαστον τῶν χαριέντων ἀνθρώπων ἔχειν καὶ οἰκεῖον καὶ φίλον πρὸς ὃν ἂν ἔλθοι θυσίας οὔσης τὸν καλοῦντα μὴ περιμείνας." Πλάτων δ' ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν λέγει οὕτως (p. 174 b) κτλ.

Athenocles of Cyzicus, with a better understanding of the Homeric poetry than Aristarchus, explains to us with greater refinement that Homer passed Menelaus over without mention because he was more closely related in kinship to Agamemnon. And Demetrius of Phalerum declared that the inclusion of the verse "for he knew in his heart that his brother was troubled" is awkward and foreign to the poet's style, and imputes meanness to the characters. "For," says he, "I think that every man of refinement has someone, either relative or friend, to whom he can go when a feast is on without waiting for an invitation." And Plato, in *The Symposium*, has this to say on the same subject (p. 174b) etc.²³

Athenaeus then goes on to discuss the passage from the *Symposium* where Plato quotes the proverb according to which the ἀγαθοὶ go αὐτόματοι to the feasts held by the ἀγαθοί: Plato also mentions the passage from *Iliad* 2.407ff. with a disquisition as to whether or not it

²² Transl. by C. Burton Gulick (Loeb 1928).

²³ Ibid.

was suitable for Homer to present Menelaus as going αὐτόματος to Agamemnon's dinner, claiming that Menelaus ranked below Agamemnon. However in Plato there is no reference to l. 409 and no mention in the terms discussed above of the attendant problems it could raise. Therefore Demetrius of Phalerum is the most ancient authority we have on this particular question. Basically, then, what we are dealing with is a problem of internal coherence of the Homeric passage. For if it is right and proper, according to the established rules of personal relations, for Menelaus to go to Agamemnon's dinner of his own accord, i.e. αὐτόματος, as l. 408 would have it, then the motivation supplied in l. 409 is quite out of place: it "is awkward and foreign to the poet's style, and imputes meanness to the characters."

Introducing the discussion on the discrepancy of l. 409, Athenaeus asserts that some authorities have added the verse (τινὲς στίχον προσέγραψαν), i.e. that the line was an interpolation²⁴ which had evidently been added without accepting or without understanding the supposed profound value of the declaration that Menelaus went αὐτόματος to Agamemnon's dinner. That l. 409 was not authentic was clearly also the opinion held by Demetrius of Phalerum, who argued that acceptance of the line would have been foreign to the poet's style (τῆς ποιήσεως ἄλλοτρίαν). However we cannot definitely state that he was the first to maintain that l. 409 is spurious, but only that to our knowledge he is the most ancient author to have expressed this opinion.²⁵ The suggestion of deleting the line was certainly a subject of discussion among Alexandrian philologists. Like Demetrius of Phalerum, Athenocles of Cyzicus (a grammarian of the Alexandrian age, possibly anterior to Aristarchus or at the most contemporary, against whom the Aristarchean pupil Ammonios polemically wrote a Πρὸς Ἀθηνοκλέα²⁶) was favorable to athetizing the line. It would also appear that Aristarchus held the opposite view and did not athetize the line (allusion in the words:

²⁴ Cf. A. Ludwich, *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1884–85; repr. Hildesheim and New York: Olms, 1971) I:216–17; M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden: Brill, 1963–64) II:499; H. Erbse *ad sch. Il.* 2.405–9; discussed by G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad. A Commentary*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) I:157–58 (409 possible oral or rhapsodic expansion of 408?).

²⁵ Ludwich, l.c.: "Von wem die Athetese des genannten Verses ausging, sagt er [*scil.* Athenaeus] nicht."

²⁶ L. Cohn, *Athenokles* 5, in *RE* II 2 (1896) 2049; Ludwich 1884–85, I:49, 51; M. Mueller, *De Seleuco Homérico* (Diss. Göttingen 1891) 11–14.

μᾶλλον Ἀριστάρχου κατακούων τῶν Ὀμηρικῶν ἐπῶν): perhaps a trace of this has remained in the scholia to this passage, where the question is discussed.²⁷ Moreover, the source used by Athenaeus throughout the discussion on l. 409 shared the view that l. 409 was not authentic since it was incoherent with l. 408 and was therefore to be deleted: this source, openly antiaristarchean, is thought to have been the grammarian Seleukos, of the first imperial age, known for his frequently critical attitude towards Aristarchus and the Aristarchean tradition.²⁸ From these considerations, then, it can be concluded that this specific problem of internal consistency of the Homeric passage was indeed a subject of discussion among Alexandrian philologists: Aristarchus (and pupils and followers as well?) interpreted the text in such a manner as to save l. 409, while others (like Demetrius of Phalerum, Athenocles of Cyzicus, Athenaeus' source [Seleukos?]) emphasized the inconsistency and opted in favor of athetizing it.

The most ancient authority known to have noticed these contradictory elements and to have believed the line to be spurious was, we said, Demetrius of Phalerum. It seems likely that we have the remains of a *zétēma* in genuine peripatetic style, perhaps for example on the Homeric representation of the *symposia*, on rules and customs in *symposia* or something of this nature, in which interpretation of the text also led naturally to debate on an issue of coherence. But even if it is clear that Demetrius of Phalerum went as far as to argue explicitly that l. 2.409 was not "authentic," it is difficult to ascribe to him the further step of proposing an "athetesis" in the strict sense, i.e. in the true Alexandrian sense of the term. However a brief chronological description needs to be given at this point. Demetrius fled to Alexandria after 297 (i.e. after the death of Cassander) and he was certainly still alive in 283 when Ptolemy II came to the throne: it is plausible that in this period he devoted himself particularly to literature. The *akmè* of Zenodotus is placed under

²⁷ Cf. Erbse *ad sch. Il.* 2.408 and 409.

²⁸ On the sources of Athenaeus V 1–20, cf. Mueller 1891, 11–14; I. Düring, *Herodikus the Crateteian* (Stockholm: Kungl. Vitt. Hist. O. Akt. Akademiens Hanglingar, Del 51:2, 1941) 90–105: the main source of the section dealing with convivial customs is Herodikus of Seleuceia, called ὁ Κρατήτειος, a grammarian of the 2nd c. B.C., a follower of Crates of Mallos and an opponent of Aristarchus and his school; the part concerning *Iliad* 2.404–9 and particularly the discussion of l. 409 is traced back precisely to Seleukos, of the first imperial age, antiaristarchean as well: it was inserted by some unknown grammarian into Herodikus material. Cf. also Erbse *ad sch. Il.* 2.408 and 409.

Ptolemy I, i.e. before 283, even though he completed his work under Ptolemy II. Therefore there was a period in which Demetrius and Zenodotus were both active in Alexandria, Demetrius being the older of the two (born perhaps around 345) and contributing authoritatively to the development of the city's cultural institutions. Zenodotus, on the other hand, who would have been younger (born perhaps around 330–325), was a preceptor of the royal family and was later appointed as its first librarian.²⁹

In the light of these observations, it is perhaps not altogether unrealistic to suggest that Demetrius of Phalerum's Homeric criticism stimulated debate and in-depth inquiry in Alexandrian intellectual circles during the initial period of Hellenistic philology. Perhaps we may perceive the glimmers here of a first phase in which traditional peripatetic discussions on the works of poets—mainly Homer—provided stimuli and materials that would then be reworked with a variety of different methods, at the dawn of scientific philology. Perhaps this is a single but good example. Perhaps during this period Demetrius of Phalerum's observation on the passage of *Iliad* 2 may actually have given rise to a proposal of a Zenodotean *obelós*. But at this point I have overreached myself in the direction of speculation and a word of caution against the development of hypotheses is in order now.

Stobaeus (3.5.43) preserves a quotation from Hermippus (taken from a work entitled *Συναγωγή τῶν καλῶς ἀναφωνηθέντων ἐξ Ὁμήρου*), in which it is said that Demetrius of Phalerum claimed that line *Od.* 23.296 had been composed by Homer εἰς σωφροσύνην (Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς εἰς σωφροσύνην ἔλεγε ταῦτα ποιεῖν: 145 = fr. 193 W; FGrHist 228 F 33).³⁰ We know from Diogenes Laertius that Hermippus wrote on Demetrius of Phalerum (a biography, perhaps?)³¹ and it is pos-

²⁹ R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968) 99ff.; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 114, 314f., 689 f.; R. Blum, *Kallimachos. The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography* (Frankfurt 1977). Engl. transl. by H. H. Wellish (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991) 99–107; N. J. Richardson, *Aristotle and Hellenistic Scholarship*, in *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, tome XL. Entretiens préparés et présidés par Franco Montanari (Vandoeuvres and Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1994) 13f.

³⁰ Hermippus fr. 92 W (*Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, hrsg. v. F. Wehrli: Suppl. 1. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer* [Basel and Stuttgart 1974]).

³¹ DL 5.78 = Demetrius of Phalerum 1.34–44 = fr. 69 W = Hermippus fr. 58 W.

sible that he lifted Demetrius of Phalerum's observation on *Od.* 23.296 to include it in a collection of καλῶς ἀναφωνηθέντα taken from Homer. An analogy with the previous case can be recognized: thus if the previous fragment concerned correct behavior in the *symposia*, here we are dealing with reflections and precepts of a philosophical-moral nature found in Homer, or rather with comments on Homeric passages from a moral point of view.³²

But what is the significance of the observation by Demetrius? *Od.* 23.296 is the line that ratifies the re-union of Odysseus and Penelope, the very end of Odysseus' wanderings and his return to his family: therefore the σωφροσύνη should reside, I would argue, in Odysseus' preference for returning home and accepting the love of his legitimate spouse, rejecting the temptations and enticements that lured him during his journeys, as well as in Penelope's patient wait for her legitimate husband's return as against all the overtures and gifts from her suitors. All this education to the σωφροσύνη of the adventures of the *Odyssey* is condensed and ratified in the moment in which husband and wife, happy and full of desire, finally return to their original bed, in line *Od.* 23.296.

Sch. *Od.* 23.296 ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο] ἀσπαστῶς καὶ ἐπιθυμητικῶς ὑπεμνήσθησαν τοῦ πάλαι τῆς συνουσίας νόμου. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος πέρας τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας τοῦτο ποιοῦνται - ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἔκοντο] τοῦτο τέλος τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης.

The scholiastic claim that Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus had indicated the τέλος or πέρας of the *Odyssey* as residing in *Od.* 23.296 has given rise to a debate in modern criticism concerning the meaning to be attributed to this observation. Essentially, two basic possibilities can be outlined: either the two great Alexandrian grammarians intended to state that the authentic *Odyssey* actually ended at that line and that all following material was therefore spurious, or they intended to state that the τέλος of the action in the Aristotelian sense was contained at this point, i.e. that *Od.* 23.296 represented the culminating point of the meaning, the final solution of the essential line of the whole poem.³³ I do not wish to investigate this question here: suffice it to say

³² There is a parallel in Dicaearchus fr. 92 W (from sch. *Od.* 1.332), concerning the first appearance of Penelope among the suitors in *Od.* 1.332ff.

³³ L. E. Rossi, "La fine alessandrina dell'Odissea e lo ζῆλος Ὀμηρικός di Apollonio Rodio," *Rivista di Filologia e Istr. Class.* 96 (1968) 151-63; Pfeiffer 1968, 116, 175-77, 231 n. 1; C. Gallavotti, "Tracce della Poetica di Aristotele negli scolii omerici,"

that there is good likelihood that Demetrius of Phalerum's focus on *Od.* 23.296 represented an early stand on the significance of this point. The actual verse itself does not seem to offer profound teaching as regards σωφροσύνη, but it acquires much greater depth of meaning if it is seen as the culminating point of the adventures of Odysseus and Penelope in the sense described above. It is impossible to assess exactly what Demetrius thought in philological terms, nor can it be ascertained whether he truly held an opinion as to whether some parts were authentic and others spurious (as happened to be the case with *Il.* 2.409).³⁴ But his attention undeniably focused closely on that particular point of the *Odyssey* 23.296, and he can hardly have failed to be aware of the types of issues raised here concerning the meaning of the passage in relation to the meaning of the whole poem, regardless of any question of authenticity or otherwise of the subsequent parts.

Aristotle had given an exemplary synopsis of the poem's main plot in his *Poetics* (ch. 17, 1455 b 16–23), indicating that it reached its goal with the suitors' death and the rest consisted of episodes. Thus in Aristotle's conception the τέλος of the *Odyssey* was achieved with Odysseus' vengeance and his successful reappropriation of his home and his kingdom. I would suggest it is not unlikely that discussions on the main plot of the *Odyssey* and on the culminating point of a well-rounded narrative continued within peripatetic circles subsequently to Aristotle's statement, with Demetrius of Phalerum putting forward not exactly the same view, but a slightly different position as compared to that held by Aristotle: and such a position may have received attention in Alexandria and undergone further development among the grammarians. Perhaps we can add an observation in this regard, which will serve to underline this significant, though not drastic, difference of opinion. Aristotle's viewpoint rests on a reading of the *Odyssey* that was more linked to a heroic conception, so that the essential themes were thought to be Odysseus' experience of wars and political affairs, his participation in the expedition to Troy and his subsequent return, his prolonged absence from home and his lengthy wanderings, the danger to his

Maia 21 (1969) 208–14; H. Erbse, *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1972) 166–77; Richardson 1994, 21f.; also Montanari, *Studi filol.* 1995 (see note 15), partic. 21ff.

³⁴ Wehrli *ad loc.* comments: "Es handelt sich um den Vers, mit dem Aristophanes und Aristarchus die Odyssee schließen lassen; vielleicht stützt D. mit seiner moralischen Würdigung die gleiche Auffassung."

household and kingdom caused by internal enemies, his revenge and triumphant return. The other view holds that the real culminating point and the real solution to the poem—and therefore in some sense the enshrinement of its true meaning—lies in the moment when husband and wife are reunited and in the reestablishment of marital bliss between the protagonist and his faithful wife. Such a view points to a reading oriented more towards feelings and human interest, more sensitive to intimacy and sentiment. This latter reading, which seems to reflect more profound observation of the psychology of the characters and more attention to the sentimental themes, is suggestive of a more “Menandrian” reading and is perhaps closer to Hellenistic tastes. Nevertheless, this is a difference of orientation which can already be traced in Aristotle’s *Poetics*, in his considerations on the difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The development flowed within the Aristotelian-peripatetic stream.

The third fragment of Demetrius of Phalerum’s Homeric criticism is provided by the sch. *Od.* 3.267 (144 = fr. 191 [+146 = 192] W; FGrH 228 F 32a [+32b]). The comment concerns the famous passage in which Nestor, at Pylos, tells Telemachus about Clytemnestra, Aegisthus and the murder of Agamemnon, and more specifically the lines that tell how Agamemnon had entrusted his wife to a bard when he left for Troy. Aegisthus makes an attempt on Clytemnestra’s virtue:

ἡ δ' ἢ τοι τὸ πρὶν μὲν ἀναίνετο ἔργον αἰκές,	265
δίῃα Κλυταιμνήστρη· φρεσὶ γὰρ κέχρητ' ἀγαθῇσι·	
παρ δ' ἄρ' ἔην καὶ ἀοιδὸς ἀνὴρ, ᾧ πόλλ' ἐπέτελλεν	
Ἀτρεΐδης Τροίηνδε κιὼν εἴρυσθαι ἄκοιτιν.	
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μιν μοῖρα θεῶν ἐπέδησε δαμῆναι,	
δὴ τότε τὸν μὲν ἀοιδὸν ἄγων ἐς νῆσον ἐρήμην	270
κάλλιπεν οἴωνοῖσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι,	
τὴν δ' ἐθέλων ἐθέλουσιν ἀνήγαγεν ὄνδε δόμονδε.	

Homer does not tell us the name of the bard of l. 267 and it is only natural that speculation on this matter has been rife: a scholium reports that some believed him to have been called Chariades (or Charidemos according to one manuscript), others Demodokos, others Glaukos. This passage and Clytemnestra’s bard was a subject also addressed by Dicaearchus (fr. 93 W),³⁵ who says that “the ancients thought that the singer was also wise, as is clear from the one left with Clytemnestra.”

³⁵ From Philodemus, *On Music*, p. 20, 32.21 Kemke.

Here the theme is "the ancients thought that the singers were wise," but no name is given. It seems that Aristoxenus (fr. 123 W) touched on the same theme, but I am not sure if the material immediately following the name of Aristoxenus in Strabo 1.2.3 is also to be assigned to Aristoxenus himself: here too no name of the bard is given. The *excerptum* of Demetrius of Phalerum in sch. *Od.* 3.267 is much richer and places the issue in a broader context.

This is the content of the scholium: Menelaus went to Delphi together with Odysseus to question the oracle concerning the forthcoming expedition against Troy. At that time Creon was ἀγωνοθέτης of the nine-yearly Pythian games: the race was won by Demodokos Lacon, a disciple of Automedes of Mycenae, who was the first to write an epic poem on the battle of Amphytrion against the Teleboai and also wrote another on the contest between Cithaeron and Helicon, after whom the mountains of Boeotia were named. Automedes was therefore a disciple of Perimedes of Argos, who was the teacher of Automedes of Mycenae himself and also of Licymnios of Bouprasion, Sinis the Dorian, Pharidas the Lacon and Probolos the Spartan. So Menelaus dedicated to Athena Pronoia a necklace belonging to Helen. Demodokos, on the other hand, was given the task by Agamemnon, who had brought him to Mycenae, of guarding Clytemnestra. They held the bards in high esteem as masters of divine and ancient noble actions,³⁶ and they loved the lyre above all other instruments. Even Clytemnestra manifested the high regard she had for the bard, by ordering that he not be killed but banished instead. Timolaos said that Demodokos was the brother of Phemios, who followed Penelope to Ithaca to act as her guard: therefore, only because he was forced to did he sing for the suitors.

Thus the bard to whom Agamemnon had entrusted Clytemnestra was called Demodokos and he was Lacon. His presence is explained in the fragment by the fact that Menelaus is claimed to have met him at the poetry competition in Delphi and later Agamemnon is supposed to have taken him to Mycenae (the *excerptum* does not preserve the explanation of all the transitional steps). The high esteem in which bards were held at the time thus explains his role in this episode: one may note that the

³⁶ Cf. Dicaearchus' fragment 93 W and Strabo 1.2.3 (Aristoxenus fr. 123 W [*Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, hrsg. v. F. Wehrli: 1. *Aristoxenos*, 2nd ed. (Basel and Stuttgart 1967)]), quoted above: cf. C. S. Floratos, *Strabon über Literatur und Poseidonios* (Athens, 1972) 12, 43–44.

same role is attributed also to Phemios, acting as Penelope's guard, and recall Dicaearchus' fragment quoted above. Such was the solution Demetrius gave to the problem of identifying the bard mentioned by Homer in *Od.* 3.267, a solution which—to my knowledge—is unparalleled, whether this Demodokos is meant to be the same Demodokos of the Phaeacians or a different and homonymous figure.³⁷

By itself, this is just an erudite detail. However there is one aspect highlighted by this fragment that goes beyond this basic account and is worth emphasizing. Demetrius of Phalerum tells us that the bard Demodokos Lacon was a disciple of Automedes of Mycenae; now, the teacher of the latter was Perimedes of Argos, who was also the teacher of other singers, and these are listed. A teacher-pupil *diadochè* is therefore delineated, as follows: Perimedes ↔ Automedes ↔ Demodokos Lacon. Moreover, a number of other singers are mentioned by name and all of them, like Automedes, were disciples of Perimedes of Argos. At the end a Timolaos is quoted and in all probability the reference here is to Timolaos of Larisa,³⁸ a pupil of Anaximenes of Lampsacus and therefore more or less a contemporary (perhaps a little younger) of Demetrius of Phalerum. It is interesting to note that Timolaos contended that Demodokos was the brother of Phemios, the bard of the royal palace at Ithaca: we must therefore deduce from this that Timolaos agreed with the identification put forward by Demetrius for Clytemnestra's bard and added his own contribution in the form of this family relationship and the idea that Phemios too acted as a guard. I cannot say whether it was Demetrius himself who cited Timolaos or whether the second citation was added by the source of the scholiastic material, but in any

³⁷ According to Wehrli, comm. *ad* 191–92, this Demodokos is the same as Demodokos of the Phaeacians, the supposition being that he met the heroes (Menelaus and Agamemnon) at the Pythian games and then sang of their enterprises to the Phaeacians: cf. A. Gostoli, "La figura dell'aedo preomerico nella filologia peripatetica ed ellenistica: Demodoco tra mito e storia," *Scrivere e recitare. Modelli di trasmissione del testo poetico nell'antichità e nel medioevo*, a cura di G. Cerri (Roma: Ediz. dell'Ateneo, 1986) 103–26; as different persons are given in *RE* s.vv. In Pausanias 1.2.3 there is mention both of Demodokos at the court of Alcinoos and also of the poet left by Agamemnon with the latter's wife: this poet is not given any name and therefore Pausanias either does not know or does not accept the idea of Demetrius of Phalerum; the same can be said of Strabo 1.2.3, quoted above.

³⁸ Also cited by Eustathius at *Od.* 11.521 (1697.57); his Homeric activities are known: he had doubled the *Iliad* by adding a line to each line: cf. K. Ziegler, *Timolaos* 6, in *RE* VI A, 1 (1936) 1275–76.

case Timolaos of Larisa was plainly dealing with the same problem and adopting a similar approach.

A similar content is displayed by the citation from Tzetzes, *Prolegomena to Lycophron*, 4, 5ff. Scheer (146 = fr. 192 W; FGrHist 228 F 32b), where it is said that Demetrius of Phalerum mentioned a few very ancient poets who had written songs to be performed with the accompaniment of musical instruments: the names are those of the *Kerkyraioi* (*sic*: probable confusions in the tradition of the material?) Automedes, Demodokos and Chaeris, the Ithacan Phemios and others.

I have not carried out in-depth research into all the names mentioned here, gathering together all the available evidence on these figures. I suspect that the evidence will turn out to be very scanty. However the aspect I wish to underline here is the general interest in very ancient poets, the bards who preceded Homer, an interest which usually starts out from the bards mentioned in the Homeric poems. This is a type of information found in the *Lives of Homer*, where there is often talk of poets prior to Homer: relations between such poets and Homer are frequently suggested, identifying them as his teachers or in some sense as part of a *diadochè* that included him, or even inserting them into his genealogical tree. The *Lives of Homer* were put together at a fairly late date, but there is a strong likelihood that the information contained therein derived from an erudition that may well go back to respectable antiquity. The inventions that developed around the bards of the *Odyssey*, around other figures of minstrels prior to Homer together with the genealogy and teachers of the poet are quite likely to have sprung up just as gratuitously as the other elements of a biographical tradition that had little to rely on in the way of personal declarations by the author about himself, but which nevertheless exploited as far as possible the information supplied by the poetic text. Indeed, peripatetic research followed this method with remarkable achievements. At a certain point this type of information evidently found suitable channels through which it took shape more concretely and a multifaceted biographical tradition began to form.

As early as in Herodotus, the claim was made that Homer and Hesiod were the most ancient known poets, while the poets who were said to have lived before them were actually of a later date. But it was Aristotle, in the *Poetics* (4.4, 1448 b 27ff.), who codified not only the established image of Homer as the author of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Margites*, but also the idea of Homer as the most ancient poet whose works have

come down to us: prior to Homer there were many other poets but, it was said, their works are lost and for us poetry starts with Homer. This historical-literary conception became the standard view in the Alexandrian age, both as regards Homer's "authentic" works (*Iliad*, *Odyssey* and *Margites*) and also as regards his priority in time and the idea that before him there lived a multitude of poets whose works have not been preserved. Thus in one way or another, investigation touched on the problem of these poets of very ancient times, poets who lived before the "first" poet of Greek culture.

The effort to bring the pre-Homeric poetry into sharper focus led to the attempt to recover some supposed data by starting from the texts and adopting a number of different procedures, irrespective of the type of text and with little heed for how far-fetched the conjectures might be. In order to organize these data, scholars resorted to cultural models that were already well established in collective intellectual consciousness and operated very effectively: genealogy, an extremely ancient structure for the organization of mythical and historical time, and the *diadochè*, linkage through succession based on a cultural and intellectual bond rather than on family relationships. Genealogical or teacher-pupil connections, or both together, clearly provided a response to the need to establish structural links both within a pre-Homeric timescape shrouded in semi-legendary mists and also between this and the emergence of a figure such as Homer. Aristotle's codification must have given a decisive impulse in this direction, which in some sense was part of an embryonic need for history of literature that would later be developed along various lines through the research of the erudites in the Hellenistic age. Here too I do not wish to stray beyond the bounds of plausible speculation, but it seems to me that the information concerning Demetrius of Phalerum fits very well into this framework, that is to say, the interest in the pre-Homeric and in providing a structured picture of this obscure age. Indeed, I would argue that the significance of this fragment goes beyond the mere curiosity of an erudite hankering after an ingenious solution to a *zétéma*.³⁸

³⁹ F. Montanari, "Il grammatico Tolomeo Pindarione, i poemi omerici e la scrittura," *Ricerche di Filologia Classica. I* (Pisa: Giardini, 1981) 97–114; Id., *Introduzione a Omero. Con un'appendice su Esiodo*, 2nd ed. (Firenze: Sansoni, 1992) 13–17; Blum 1977, 47–49; G. Arrighetti, *Poeti, eruditi, biografì. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura* (Pisa: Giardini, 1987); Gostoli 1986.

I have no difficulty in acknowledging that in order to extract reasonably interesting results from these meagre remains it has been necessary to indulge in deductions and speculations, which do not constitute conclusive evidence and offer neither irrefutable data nor a large number of clues. Yet I would argue that overall this investigation has not been without foundation, above and beyond this or that specific point. If my arguments concerning Demetrius of Phalerum's criticism of Homer are granted some validity as a whole, then I think we can perceive, albeit dimly, some of the ways in which peripatetic research on works of literature (poetry) and the personalities of authors (poets) acted as a crucial impetus along the road that led to Alexandrian philology: we can perceive the elements of a link that remains of primary importance, namely the relationship between Aristotle and his school and Alexandria.³⁰

⁴⁰ L. E. Rossi, "Umanesimo e filologia (a proposito della Storia della filologia classica di Rudolf Pfeiffer)," *Rivista di Filologia e Istr. Class.* 104 (1976) 98–117; Blum 1977, 47–49, 99–107 and passim; F. Montanari, "L'erudizione, la filologia, la grammatica," in *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, vol. I, t. II, 235ff. (Roma: Salerno Ed., 1993) partic. 259–64; G. Arrighetti 1987; Richardson 1994.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

8

Gli *Aesopica* di Demetrio Falereo

Elisabetta Matelli

Lo status quaestionis

In questo breve studio mi propongo di considerare alcuni aspetti della tradizione delle favole esopiche in rapporto a Demetrio Falereo, uomo

* Quando nel testo e nelle note mi riferirò alla edizione di favole di B. E. Perry, *Aesopica* (Urbana 1953), segnalerò con "T ... Perry" le testimonianze su Esopo e con "F ... Perry" le favole.

Nel presente articolo mi riferirò spesso a fonti letterarie che contengono favole accompagnando la citazione ora con riferimenti del tipo: "Theogn. 602 West cfr. F 176 Perry," ora del tipo: "Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1401ss = F 423 Perry." Nel primo tipo di citazione intendo riferirmi all'edizione degli *Aesopica* del Perry, dove tuttavia il testo della favola è pubblicato sulla base di una fonte diversa (generalmente si tratta di collezioni favolistiche tradite per via diretta in manoscritti medioevali); nel secondo caso invece intendo evidenziare che il Perry cita la medesima fonte letteraria antica.

Questa distinzione è utile per riconoscere quali favole citate nei testi letterari di età arcaica, classica ed ellenistica confluiscono poi nelle successive collezioni tradite nei manoscritti di età medioevale e quali invece ci giungono solo attraverso i testi letterari antichi, senza essere entrate nelle collezioni a noi note.

Oltre alle voci A. Hausrath, "Fabel," *RE* VI (1909) 1704–36; O. Crusius, "Babrius," *RE* II (1896) 2655–67 e A. Hausrath, "Phaedrus," *RE* XIX (1937) 1475–1505, segnalo alcuni degli studi più recenti e importanti sulla tradizione delle favole esopiche (contenenti ulteriore bibliografia):

B. E. Perry, "Demetrius of Phalerum and the Aesopic Fables," *TAPA* 93 (1962) 287–346 e, dello stesso, *Babrius and Phaedrus* (London e Cambridge, Mass. 1965) Introduction.

politico e filosofo peripatetico, allievo di Aristotele e di Teofrasto¹ e autore di quella che si ritiene essere la prima collezione di favole esopiche, capostipite della successiva tradizione favolistica.

A questo fine è particolarmente utile tener presente sia i collegamenti di Demetrio con la scuola peripatetica (che aveva elaborato un proprio sistema di ricerca anche in ambito poetico-letterario e antiquario) sia il fatto che egli visse ed operò per circa una ventina di anni ad Alessandria (circa dal 300 al 283 a.C.),² in stretto contatto con la vita di corte e incaricato dal primo Tolomeo di costituire una biblioteca che raccogliesse i libri “da tutto il mondo”:³ non è difficile immaginare che egli avesse stretti rapporti non solo con il monarca, ma anche con la cerchia dei poeti e filologi richiamati nella nuova capitale del regno di Egitto, almeno fino all'avvento al trono del Filadelfo.

Il primo e unico dato certo che abbiamo dell'attività di Demetrio sulle favole esopiche sono le parole di Diogene Laerzio nella *Vita di*

M. Nøjgaard, *La fable antique*, Tome I, *La fable grecque avant Phèdre* (København 1964). In particolare le pagine 477–79 riguardano la raccolta di Demetrio.

F. Rodríguez Adrados, *Historia de la fábula greco-latina*, Volumen I, *Introducción y de los orígenes a la edad Helenística* (Madrid 1979) in particolare le pagine 421–508.

A. A. V. V., *La Fable*, *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique*, XXX (Vandoeuvres e Genève 1984).

Der Aesop-Roman, ed. N. Holzberg (Tübingen 1992) [Classica Monacensia 6].

N. Holzberg, *Die Antike Fabel. Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt 1993).

Questo breve elenco non ha naturalmente l'ambizione di essere esaustivo. Altra bibliografia è citata nelle successive note dell'articolo.

¹ Nessuna fonte parla esplicitamente di Demetrio come allievo di Aristotele: sembra tuttavia indubitabile che egli abbia seguito le lezioni di Aristotele, data l'intensa attività d'insegnamento del grande maestro ad Atene fino al 323 a.C. Le fonti menzionano solo il nome di Teofrasto, a cui Demetrio fu particolarmente legato. Vedi E. Martini, s.v. “Demetrios 85,” *RE* IV (1901), c. 2818, 60–67.

² E. A. Parsons, *The Alexandrian Library. Glory of the Hellenic World* (Amsterdam, London e New York 1952) 124–38 e 160.

³ Demetrius ap. Aristeae *Ep. ad Philocratem* = fr. 59 SOD. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1969) 99–100, nega che le informazioni di questa fonte siano attendibili. In questo articolo cercherò di mostrare che, almeno per quanto riguarda il ruolo di Demetrio ad Alessandria, Aristeae sembra presentare fatti confermati in modo indiretto anche da altre fonti. Se lo Pfeiffer tendeva a mettere in secondo piano il ruolo avuto dai Peripatetici ad Alessandria, invece la più recente storia della filologia ellenistica attribuisce loro una parte fondamentale: vedi R. Blum, *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnis bei den Griechen* (Frankfurt am Main 1977), F. Montanari, *L'erudizione, la filologia e la grammatica* in *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, I, 2, 259–64 e N. J. Richardson, *Aristotle and Hellenistic Scholarship* in *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* XL (Genève 1994) 7–28, con la discussione alle pagine 29–38.

Demetrio (V 80 e 81 = 1 SOD) che mi sembra utile presentare nel loro contesto (segnalerò in grassetto i termini riguardanti le favole esopiche, mentre saranno sottolineate le parole significative del contesto):

Πλήθει δὲ βιβλίων καὶ ἀριθμῷ στίχων σχεδὸν ἅπαντας παρελήλακε τοὺς καθ' αὐτὸν περιπατητικούς, εὐπαίδευτος ὢν καὶ πολύπειρος παρ' ὄντινοῦν· ὢν ἐστὶ τὰ μὲν ἱστορικά, τὰ δὲ πολιτικά, τὰ δὲ περὶ ποιητῶν, τὰ δὲ ῥητορικά, δημηγοριῶν τε καὶ πρεσβειῶν, ἀλλὰ μὲν καὶ λόγων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγὰ καὶ ἄλλα πλείω. ἔστι δὲ τὰ

Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας α' β' γ' δ' ε',

Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι πολιτειῶν α' β',

Περὶ δημαγωγίας α' β',

Περὶ πολιτικῆς α' β',

Περὶ νόμων α',

Περὶ ῥητορικῆς α' β',

Στρατηγικῶν α' β',

Περὶ Ἰλιάδος α' β',

Περὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας α' β' γ' δ',

Πτολεμαῖος α',

Ἐρωτικὸς α',

Φαιδώνδας α',

Μαίδων α',

Κλέων α',

Σωκράτης α',

Ἀρταξέρξης α',

Ὀμηρικὸς α',

Ἀριστείδης α',

Ἀριστόμαχος α',

Προτρεπτικὸς α',

Ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτείας α',

Περὶ τῆς δεκαετίας α',

Περὶ τῶν Ἰώνων α',

Πρεσβευτικὸς α',

Περὶ πίστεως α'

Περὶ χάριτος α',

Περὶ τύχης α',

Περὶ μεγαλοψυχίας α',

Περὶ γάμου α',

Περὶ τοῦ δοκοῦ α',
 Περὶ εἰρήνης α',
 [Περὶ νόμων α'],⁴
 Περὶ ἐπιτηδευμάτων α',
 Περὶ καιροῦ α',
 Διονύσιος α',
 Χαλκιδικὸς α',
 Ἀθηναίων καταδρομὴ α',
 Περὶ Ἀντιφάνους α',
 Προοίμιον ἱστορικὸν α',
 Ἐπιστολαὶ α',
 Ἐκκλησία ἔνορκος α',
 Περὶ γήρως α',
 Δίκαια α',
 Αἰσωπείων α',
 Χρειῶν α'

Nelle fonti antiche non esiste nessun'altra citazione esplicita della collezione di favole esopiche di Demetrio.

Diogene Laerzio parla di συναγωγαί, ed è evidente dal contesto che il plurale è richiesto dalla pluralità delle raccolte, trattandosi di δημηγοριῶν τε καὶ πρεσβειῶν, ἀλλὰ μὲν καὶ λόγων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγαί: sembra dunque che, su questa base, non debbano nascere interrogativi relativi al plurale,⁵ né che si debba sospettare un'opera in più libri⁶ o l'uso da parte di Demetrio di diverse recensioni della *Vita di Esopo*.⁷

Prendendo spunto dalle parole di Fedro nel Prologo del IV Libro di *Fabulae*, dove il favolista latino afferma di presentare favole *quas Aesopias, non Aesopi nomino, quia paucas ille ostendit, ego plures sero, usus vetusto genere sed rebus novis* (11–13),⁸ potremmo osservare come nelle locuzioni λόγων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγαί e Αἰσωπείων α' di Diogene Laerzio (V 80 e 81) sia usato l'aggettivo Αἰσώπειος al posto

⁴ H. S. Long, *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum* (Oxford 1964) ad loc. propone in apparato di espungere questo titolo, in quanto ripetizione del quinto.

⁵ Nøjgaard 1964, 467.

⁶ Nøjgaard, Discussion in A A. V V. 1984, 190.

⁷ F. Ribezzo, *Nuovi studi sulla origine e sulla propagazione delle favole indoe elleniche comunemente dette esopiche* (Napoli 1901) 93.

⁸ Cfr. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* s.v. "Aesopius," spiegato con "pertinens ad Aesopus 1." (c. 1085).

del genitivo Αἰσώπου. Ciò mi sembra significativo in rapporto a due fatti: 1) sia nell'elenco di opere di Aristotele, sia in quello di Teofrasto i contenuti delle συναγωγαί sono sempre definiti dai genitivi dei nomi propri degli autori dei testi raccolti, non da aggettivi derivati dai nomi propri (cfr. DL V 24, 43, 44, 47). 2) Tra le opere di Aristotele ci sono alcuni titoli con aggettivi derivati da nomi propri: oltre agli attributi Εὐδήμεια e Νικομάχεια per i libri di Ἠθικά, d'incerta interpretazione,⁹ ricordo Θεοδέκτεια del nr. 82, fr. 145 Gigon, Μενώνεια del nr. 110, fr. 353 Gigon e Ἀρχυτείου (nel titolo Περὶ τῆς Ἀρχυτείου φιλοσοφίας) del nr. 92 Gigon. A proposito di quest'ultimo titolo e di altri del genere, Gigon (1987, 405) esprime la propria difficoltà nell'interpretare tali forme aggettivali e si chiede se esse non rivelino che Aristotele trasse le dottrine di tali filosofi non solo da fonti scritte, ma anche da una tradizione orale.

Sebbene assente nei titoli delle opere di Demetrio, anche il termine συναγωγή usato da Diogene Laerzio è significativo. In età sofistica Ippia scrisse una Συναγωγή, ma purtroppo non sappiamo nulla della natura di quest'opera: solo Ateneo c'informa che in questo scritto il sofista parlò di una donna di Mileto, bella e sapiente, che ebbe 14 mariti (Hippias 86 B4 D-K).

Tra i titoli delle opere aristoteliche ci sono tre συναγωγαί, nel senso di "raccolte": Τεχνῶν συναγωγή α' β', Τέχνης τῆς Θεοδέκτου συναγωγή α' (DL V 24) e Συναγωγῆς α' β' (DL V 25); anche il successore Teofrasto s'impegnò in raccolte di testi: Τῶν Διογένους συναγωγή α' (DL V 43), Περὶ τῶν Μητροδώρου συναγωγῆς α' (DL V 44), Προβλημάτων συναγωγῆς α' β' γ' δ' ε' (DL V 45), Λόγων συναγωγή α', Τῶν Ξενοκράτους συναγωγῆς α' (DL V 47), Προβλημάτων συναγωγῆς α' (DL V 48). Questi titoli rivelano che il Peripato tenne in considerazione il metodo di raccolta sistematica di testi per argomenti, per autori e per problemi. L'attività peripatetica in questo ambito è stata certamente più vasta di quello che pochi titoli e testi frammentari ci tramandano:¹⁰ lo stesso Aristotele nell'*Etica Nicomachea* (1181b6–12), ci dice che le raccolte di leggi e di costituzioni (τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν πολιτειῶν αἱ συναγωγαί) sono principal-

⁹ Vedi le parole di O. Gigon, *Aristotelis Opera ex rec. I. Bekkeri* (Editio altera, Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1987) 511.

¹⁰ E'indubbio che anche un'opera come la teofrastea Νόμων κατὰ στοιχεῖον κδ' (DL V 44), sebbene non si chiami συναγωγή, consistesse in una raccolta di testi, per altro presentati secondo un metodo classificatorio alfabetico.

mente utili a chi ha competenze e capacità di discernimento tra buono e cattivo in materia, ma che comunque possono giovare anche agli inesperti, perché facilitano loro la comprensione dell'argomento.

Tuttavia, lo stato frammentario di questi testi peripatetici e il fatto che solo da poco abbiamo a disposizione un'edizione integrale dei frammenti teofrastei,¹¹ fanno sì che noi non possediamo ancora (per quanto è a mia conoscenza) una precisa nozione di che cosa effettivamente fossero queste συναγωγαί peripatetiche:¹² su tale punto la questione rimane ancora aperta.

Al quadro delle opere di Demetrio vanno aggiunti *Gli apoftegmi dei Sette Sapienti*, assenti nell'elenco di Diogene Laerzio, ma presenti nel *Florilegio* di Stobeo, che riporta sotto al titolo Δημητρίου Φαληρέως τῶν ἐπὶ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα un certo numero di sentenze dei sapienti Cleobulo, Solone, Chilone, Talete, Pittaco, Biante, Periandro (Stob. III 1, 172 = Demetrius, fr. 87 SOD):¹³ anche in questo caso siamo in presenza di una collezione di testi ed esiste un collegamento indiretto, ma significativo, tra questo tipo di raccolta e la tradizione delle favole esopiche. Esopo è infatti collegato ai sapienti nel *Convivio dei Sette sapienti* di Plutarco, dove il favolista partecipa al banchetto e ai discorsi dei saggi ospiti nella casa di Periandro a Corinto; è degno di nota il fatto che alla base di questo racconto sia riconoscibile una tradizione ellenistica e peripatetica.¹⁴

Demetrio "raccolse" dunque λόγοι esopici seguendo il metodo di raccolta antiquaria tipica del Peripato: le favole da lui raccolte occupavano *un libro*.

Così entriamo nel vivo del nostro problema: Quali testi costituirono i λόγοι esopici di Demetrio? Quali furono le sue fonti? Sotto che forma

¹¹ *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, P. M. Huby, R. W. Sharples (Greek and Latin) and Dimitri Gutas (Arabic), 2 vols. (Leiden, New York e Köln 1992). L'edizione verrà citata d'ora in poi con la sigla FHS&G.

¹² Vedi le parole di O. Gigon 1987, 389–90 (nr. 77); 399–400 (nr. 82), 405 (nr. 89).

¹³ Su quest'opera, vedi Martini, s.v. "Demetrios," 2836.

¹⁴ Per la fonte di Plutarco M. Paladini ("Influenza della tradizione dei Sette Savi nella vita di Solone di Plutarco," *Revue des Études Grecques* 69 [1956] 377–411) parla di Ermippo Callimacheo. Cfr. anche M. J. Luzzatto, "Plutarco, Socrate e l'Esopo di Delfi," *ILS* 13 (1988) 427–45 che riconosce, dietro a Plutarco, una fonte storica ben documentata sulle vicende del VI secolo.

Più avanti cercherò di mostrare che, per quanto riguarda la lista dei sette sapienti, Plutarco sembrerebbe seguire la tradizione di Demetrio, corretta solo per quanto riguarda il tiranno Periandro.

Demetrio presentò il materiale raccolto? Quali erano le dimensioni dell'opera? Quando e dove la scrisse? A quale fine egli raccolse le fiabe? La sua fu davvero la prima *raccolta* di fiabe esopiche, come molti studiosi riconoscono?¹⁵ Quale fu la fortuna di tale testo?

Per rispondere a ciascuna di queste domande, in mancanza d'altri dati, è innanzitutto opportuno considerare la tradizione delle favole in età arcaica e classica; volgerò poi lo sguardo all'età ellenistica, cercando le tracce dell'opera di Demetrio anche nelle raccolte di epoca imperiale.

Le fiabe nella tradizione letteraria greca dal VII al IV secolo

§1. È necessario iniziare considerando che le origini delle favole greche sono molto antiche e certamente orientali.¹⁶

-Si è soliti dire che nell'epica omerica non entrino le favole, sebbene numerose siano le similitudini con il mondo animale. Tuttavia è interessante che nel XIX libro dell'*Iliade*, l'episodio di Xanto, il cavallo di Achille che parla con il suo padrone (*Il.* 19.407–17), sia stato interpretato da successivi esegeti proprio in rapporto alla tradizione degli animali parlanti nelle favole narrate da altri poeti e da Esopo stesso.¹⁷

-In Esiodo e nei giambi di Archiloco, cioè nel VII secolo a.C., la favola s'inserisce nel testo poetico con una formula molto tenue e priva di determinazioni, del tipo : νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦς' ἐρέω,... Hesiod., *Op.* 201, oppure: αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων ὅδε, ὥς ... Arch. fr. 174 West (= 168 Tarditi), dove la parola stessa αἶνος può forse rivelare un legame con il motivo della esortazione morale propria di una letteratura sapienziale molto antica.¹⁸

¹⁵ Questa è una teoria corrente. Un utile resoconto del problema con alcuni riferimenti bibliografici essenziali in Holzberg 1992, 24–29. Tuttavia un passo degli *Uccelli* di Aristofane (Aristoph. *Aves* 471–72) con le parole οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάρτηκας sembrerebbe alludere ad un testo esopico scritto: v. M. L. West, "The Ascription of Fables to Aesop in Archaic and Classical Greece," in A.A.V.V. 1984, 121–22 e Nøjgaard 1964, 474.

¹⁶ I. Trencsényi-Waldapfel, "Eine Aesopische Fabel und ihre orientalischen Parallelen," *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* VII (1959) 317–27. Altra bibliografia alle note 18 e 33.

¹⁷ Vedi lo *Schol. Il.* T 407c: πρῶτος δὲ Ὅμηρος τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, Ἡσίοδος (sc. *Op.* 203–12) ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱέρακος, Ἀρχίλοχος (fr. 168 T = 174 W, cfr. p. 64 W) ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰετοῦ, καὶ Αἴσωπος ὕστερον κατεχρήσατο; cfr. Ael. *N.A.* XII.3. Anche Teone (*Pro-gymn.* §3, Spengel, *Rh.Gr.* II, p. 73, 15–17) scrive che già Omero conosceva le fiabe.

¹⁸ Gli editori collegano questa fiaba ad altri frammenti archilochei e, più precisamente, al contesto dell'epodo contro Licambe (vedi fr. 166ss Tarditi e 171ss West).

Mi sembra che il filone di un'antica sapienza legata alla favola sia presente anche nelle similitudini con il mondo animale dei giambi di Semonide di Amorgo;¹⁹ purtroppo la frammentarietà del testo citato dall'*Etym. Genuinum*, dall'*Etym. Magnum* e da uno scolio omerico non ci permette di conoscere la formula con cui il poeta introduceva la favola dello scarabeo e dell'aquila, che sarà poi raccontata anche da Esopo.²⁰ Nell'elegia di Solone, inoltre, per quanto si può ricostruire da un singolo frammento, il riferimento al tema di una favola (quella del vecchio leone e della volpe) s'inserisce nel testo in modo naturale, come

Cfr. le voci αἶνος e αἰνέω in LSJ, connesse etimologicamente (cfr. P. Chantraine). In particolare segnalo il valore esortativo del verbo in *Od.* 16.403. Teone riconosce il valore di esortazione contenuto nella parola αἶνος; dopo aver presentato le parole λόγος e μῦθος per indicare la fiaba, così spiega αἶνος: "αἶνος δὲ ὅτι καὶ παραίνεσίν τινα περιέχει (*Progymn.* §3, Spengel, *Rh.Gr.* II, p. 73, 31–32).

Che una parte del patrimonio favolistico greco abbia radici antichissime, che in alcuni casi affondano nella tradizione sapienziale assiro-babilonese e sumerica, è stato ampiamente dimostrato e discusso nei suoi vari aspetti da F. Nau, *Histoire et Sagesse d'Ahiqar l'Assyrien. Traduction des versions syriaques avec les principales différences des versions arabes arménienne, grecque, néo-syriaque, slave et roumaine* (Paris 1909); E. Ebeling, *Die babylonische Fabel und ihre Bedeutung für die Literaturgeschichte* (Leipzig 1927); Perry 1953, 5–9; J. J. A. van Dijk, *La sagesse suméro-accadienne* (Leiden 1953); K. Meuli, "Herkunft und Wesen der Fabel," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 50 (1954) 65–88 [= *Gesammelte Schriften II* (Basel 1975) 731–56]; A. La Penna, "Letteratura esopica e letteratura assiro-babilonese," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica* 92 (1964) 24–39. R. S. Falkowitz, "Discrimination and Condensation of Sacred Categories: the Fable in Early Mesopotamian Literature," in A. A. V. V. 1984, 1–24 (Discussione alle pagine 25–32); M. J. Luzzatto, "Grecia e Vicino Oriente: tracce della "storia di Ahiqar" nella cultura greca tra VI e V secolo a.C.," *Quaderni di Storia* 18, nr. 36 (1992) 1–84. V. *infra* anche la bibliografia citata alla nota 33.

¹⁹ V. i Frr. 3 Pellizer-Tedeschi (d'ora in poi P-T) = 11 West (abbreviato W.), 7 P-T = 7 W, 12 P-T = 5 W, 13 P-T = 8 W, 14 P-T = 9 W, 16 P-T = 12 W, 18 P-T = 14 W, 22 P-T = 18W. Il Fr. 3 P-T = 11W potrebbe forse alludere alla fiaba dell'oca dalle uova d'oro (F 87 Perry).

²⁰ Sem. Amorg. <μ>—> τὸ δ' ἡμῖν ἐρπετὸν παρέπτατο / τὸ ζῳῶν κάκιστον ἔκτῃται βίον (Fr. 17 P-T = 13 W.). A. Pellizer-I. Tedeschi, *Semonides, Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Roma 1990) 104: "e volò vicino a noi quell'insetto / che tra tutti gli animali mena il peggior modo di vita." Si tratterebbe qui dello "sfogo di Zeus che, molto contrariato per il tiro mancino giocatogli dallo scarabeo, lo ricopre d'insulti. L'insetto lo aveva infatti indotto a rompere le uova dell'aquila—che il padre degli dei aveva deciso di proteggere tenendole accanto a sé—facendovi rotolare vicino le sue graveolenti palline di sterco" (*ibid.* 181). Lo *Schol. Il.* Σ 407b riferisce il verso di Semonide alla favola dello scarabeo e dell'aquila (cfr. F 3 Perry), a cui allude in più passi anche il comico Aristofane che la attribuisce ad Esopo (Aristoph. *Pax* 27, *Lys.* 695, *Vesp.* 1446ss, v. *infra* nel testo). Nei frammenti di Semonide non ci sono tuttavia termini specifici indicanti la favola o il raccontar favole: generico, cioè equivalente a "parlare" è il significato di μειλίχως μυθεόμενος del Fr. 7.18 ("parlandole in modo dolce e carezzevole," Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990, 97).

una semplice, ma eloquente allusione nel contesto di un discorso contro la tirannide.²¹ Nel II stasimo dell'*Agamemnone* di Eschilo il canto del coro su Elena entrata a Ilio come sposa di Paride e causa di terribili lutti (inizialmente era stata accolta a Ilio come una creatura meravigliosa, ma poi fu causa di orribili stragi e distruzioni) è interrotto dal racconto di un leoncino strappato ancor piccolo alla madre e allevato in una casa di uomini: finché piccolo esso sembrava facilmente adattarsi alla casa e al padrone, verso il quale si comportava con l'affetto di un piccolo bimbo; ma appena cresciuto, il leone rivelò la sua vera natura compiendo terribili stragi proprio dentro alla famiglia che l'aveva allevato come un figlio (Aesch. Ag. 717–36 Fraenkel). Nessuna formula introduce la similitudine tra questa favola e la storia di Elena; tuttavia la giustapposizione dei due racconti permette facilmente di estendere alle vicende di Elena e Paride “la morale” del racconto del leoncino (cfr. Pl. *Gorg.* 483e–484a): come l'uomo, addomesticando un giovane leone, era andato contro una legge naturale, che alle fine era però tornata a imporre drammaticamente la propria realtà causando una strage, così Paride, portando Elena a Ilio contro leggi superiori (cfr. Ag. 699–708 Fraenkel), aveva condotto nella sua città una donna meravigliosa che si tramutò in tragica rovina.

§2. Dal V secolo i riferimenti letterari alla figura di un favolista si fanno più precisi; appare la figura di Esopo e la narrazione delle favole è talora legata ad alcuni episodi della sua vita. Le *Storie* di Erodoto (II 134–35) rappresentano per noi il primo testo con un riferimento al personaggio di Esopo, con la rapida allusione ad alcuni fatti della sua vita: egli ci è presentato come *λογωποιός*, vissuto al tempo del re Amasi e schiavo di un certo Iadmone di Samo, assieme alla trace Rodopi, la quale venne poi riscattata divenendo l'amante di Carasso di Mitilene, fratello della poetessa Saffo. Erodoto narra anche che, in seguito alla sua morte violenta a Delfi, i Delfici, per consiglio dell'oracolo, offrirono un risarcimento in denaro per il suo sangue, che venne accettato da Iadmone, omonimo figlio dell'ex padrone di Esopo.²²

²¹ Solon, fr. 11 West, cfr. F 142 Perry.

²² In questo racconto si allude agli ultimi episodi della leggenda di Esopo, nota dalla tarda *Vita* (Vita G e W §127ss Perry 1953, 74 e 105): Esopo venuto in rotta con Apollo e inimicatosi con i Delfici, con un inganno venne da costoro falsamente accusato del furto di una coppa d'oro del tesoro di Apollo e condannato a morte; ma in seguito a questo omicidio i Delfici furono colpiti da un flagello, da cui Apollo consigliò di liberarsi pagando il prezzo del sangue di Esopo. V. S. Jedrkiewicz, *Sapere e paradosso nell'antichità: Esopo e la favola* (Roma 1989) 83–107.

Un esplicito riferimento a questo medesimo episodio della vita di Esopo è contenuto in alcuni versi delle *Vespe* di Aristofane: il racconto del commediografo ci dà i particolari dell'inganno perpetrato contro Esopo dai Delfici, che poi lo accusarono del furto del vaso di Apollo, episodio che Erodoto non aveva narrato. Aristofane ci informa che davanti all'ingiusta accusa Esopo rispose con una favola, di cui nelle *Vespe* riporta solo le parole iniziali "uno scarabeo una volta ..." (Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1446–49 = T 20; cfr. F 3 Perry).²³ Se ad Aristofane è sufficiente menzionare solo l'inizio, vuol dire che gli spettatori della commedia conoscevano certamente la fiaba ed erano dunque in grado di cogliere immediatamente l'allusione di Esopo ad una terribile vendetta, simile a quella dello scarabeo contro l'aquila che aveva deposto le proprie uova nel grembo di Zeus, credendole al sicuro.²⁴ Egli si riferisce a questa favola anche nella *Pace* (127–34 = T 69 Perry; cfr. F 3 Perry) dove Trigeo rammenta brevemente alla figlia il racconto esopico dello scarabeo che, unico tra gli alati ad essere volato in alto sino a raggiungere gli dei, volendosi vendicare dell'aquila, aveva fatto rotolare le sue uova giù dal grembo di Zeus;²⁵ Aristofane accenna a questa fiaba anche nella *Lisistrata* (695). La fiaba era antica, dato che già Semonide di Amorgo l'aveva menzionata (v. *supra* e nota 20).

Il commediografo narra dunque il racconto dello scarabeo in stretta connessione con un episodio della vita di Esopo²⁶ e fa lo stesso quando ci racconta le parole rivolte da Esopo, di sera e di ritorno da un banchetto, a una cagna che gli abbaia contro (*Vesp.* 1401ss = F 423 Perry).

²³ Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1446–49 (ed. Coulon):

Φι. Αἴσωπον οἱ Δελφοί ποτ'–

Βδ. ὀλίγον μοι μέλει.

Φι. φιάλην ἐπρητῶντο κλέψαι τοῦ θεοῦ.

ὁ δ' ἔλεξεν αὐτοῖς ὡς ὁ κάνθαρος ποτε–

Βδ. οἶμ', ὡς ἀπολῶ σ' αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι κανθάροις.

²⁴ Jedrkiewicz 1989, 86–87.

²⁵ Aristoph. *Pax* 127–34 (ed. Coulon):

Πα. Τίς δ' ἠπίνοιά σου σὲν ὥστε κάνθαρον
ζεύξαντ' ἐλαύνειν εἰς θεούς, ὦ παππία;

Τρ. Ἐν τοῖσιν Αἰσώπου λόγοις ἐξηυρέθη
μόνος πετηνῶν εἰς θεοὺς ἀφιγμένος.

Πα. Ἀπιστον εἶπας μῦθον, ὦ πάτερ πάτερ,
ὅπως κάκοσμον ζῶον ἦλθεν εἰς θεούς.

Τρ. Ἦλθεν κατ' ἐχθραν αἰετοῦ πάλαι ποτέ,
ὧ' ἐκκυλίνδων κἀντιτιμωρούμενος.

²⁶ Vedi i capitoli 134–39 della *Vita Aesopi* (*Vita G* e *Vita W* in Perry 1953, 76 e 106). Interessanti le osservazioni di Jedrkiewicz 1989, 86.

Anche Aristotele nella *Retorica* ci presenta una fiaba che Esopo avrebbe raccontato a Samo in difesa di un demagogo, volendo mostrare agli abitanti della città che non era male tenersi un capo così (*Rhet.* II 1393b22–33 = T 41 e F 427 Perry); questo episodio di Esopo viene citato di seguito ad uno analogo nel quale Stesicoro aveva raccontato una fiaba per mettere in guardia i cittadini di Imera contro il tiranno Falaride (Arist. *Rhet.* 1393b10–22 = F 269a Perry e cfr. F 269 Perry).

Nei *Meteorologica* (II.3 356b10–17) la leggenda di Cariddi che risucchia il mare per due volte facendo emergere prima i monti, poi le isole e che minaccia alla fine di prosciugarlo è il racconto che Esopo rivolge a un barcaiolo con cui era arrabbiato per spaventarlo: Aristotele commenta che in quella situazione era giustificato che Esopo usasse una favola del genere, ma che essa non poteva certo essere usata da chi cercasse la verità.

Solo la tradizione indiretta ci informa che Aristotele parlò della fama acquisita da Esopo come favolista nella Σαμίων Πολιτεία (*Schol. in Aristoph. Aves*, 471 White = fr. 591.1 Gigon) e che nella Δελφῶν Πολιτεία scrisse anch'egli dell'ira divina per l'omicidio di Esopo contro i Delfici, consigliati quindi dall'oracolo di pagare il prezzo del suo sangue innocente (testo entrato nelle raccolte paremiografiche, cfr. Arist. *Politeia* nr. 37, fr. 494.1–3 Gigon).

§3. Con il V secolo cominciano dunque i riferimenti letterari alla figura del favolista Esopo e la narrazione di alcune sue fiabe sembra scaturire proprio da episodi della sua vita: ma a questo proposito desidero sottolineare che *le fonti anteriori al III secolo, riferendosi all'origine di Esopo o ad episodi della sua vita, legano concordemente il favolista alla città di Samo* (Her. II 134; Arist. *Rhet.* 1393b22–33 e fr. 591.1 Gigon) *e a rapporti conflittuali con i Delfi* (Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1446–49; Arist., Δελφῶν Πολιτεία, fr. 494, 1–3 cfr. 494.4 Gigon).

§4. I testi anteriori agli *Aesopica* di Demetrio citano talora favole che chiamano “esopiche”; altre volte le qualificano con aggettivi che si riferiscono a particolari regioni, come per indicarne una precisa origine geografica: Eschilo, in un frammento dei Mirmidoni (Aesch. F 139 Radt) si riferisce ad una fiaba (= F 276a Perry; cfr. F 276 Perry) con le parole ὧδ' ἐστὶ μύθων τῶν Λιβυστικῶν κλέος, dove l'aggettivo equivale a “*Libico*” (v. Hausrath 1909, 1719–20). Anche Aristotele parla di *fiabe della Libia* nella *Retorica*, citandole al fianco di quelle esopiche (... λόγοι, οἷον οἱ Αἰσώπειοι καὶ Λιβυκοί, *Rhet.* II 1393a30–31 = T 94

Perry).²⁷ Aristofane nelle *Vespe* accosta le divertenti storielle esopiche a quelle *sibaritiche*, precisando che s'imparavano nei simposi (*Vesp.* 1259–60). Nella medesima commedia ci presenta una divertente (e assurda²⁸) storiella, raccontata da un Sibarita, che ha come protagonista una donna di Sibari (*Vesp.* 1427–40).²⁹ Il testo di un papiro ci riferisce che il poeta Timocreonte (V sec. a.C.) avrebbe usato *una fiaba di Cipro* contro Temistocle (“Κύπριος αἶνος,” Timocreon 730, 4 Page) e secondo un'altra testimonianza nelle sue poesie egli avrebbe raccontato *fiabe della Caria* (“Καρικὸς αἶνος,” Timocreon 734.8 Page).³⁰

Questi testi mostrano che già dal V secolo a.C., al fianco delle favole chiamate “esopiche,” correivano anche fiabe libiche, sibaritiche e forse anche di Cipro e della Caria.³¹ Tale sembra essere stato il materiale favolistico circolante prima della raccolta di Demetrio.

§5. Che tipo di tradizione aveva la fiaba, prima degli Aesopica di Demetrio?

-Le testimonianze parlano a favore di una tradizione prevalentemente orale: Socrate in prigione aveva messo in versi le prime favole di Esopo che gli venivano in mente e conosceva a memoria (διὰ ταῦτα δὴ οὓς προχείρους εἶχον μύθους καὶ ἠπιστάμην τοὺς Αἰσώπου, τούτους ἐποίησα οἷς πρώτοις ἐνέτυχον, Pl. *Phaedo* 61b). Già è stato presentato il passo in cui Aristofane parla esplicitamente di fiabe esopiche e sibaritiche che s'imparavano nei simposi (Αἰσωπικὸν γέλοιον ἢ Συβαριτικόν, ὧν ἔμαθες ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ, *Vesp.* 1259–60).

-Tuttavia sempre Aristofane, in un verso di discussa interpretazione,

²⁷ Nell'*Economico* ps. aristotelico (I 6.3 1345a2–5) si citano due apoftegmi, pronunciati da un uomo della Persia e da uno della Libia: in quest'ultimo potrebbe esserci l'allusione a un detto esopico (T 91 Perry).

²⁸ La sciocchezza del racconto sarebbe una caratteristica delle fiabe sibaritiche, e ciò avrebbe causato la successiva teorizzazione che contrapponeva le fiabe di animali (esopiche) a quelle di uomini (sibaritiche), cfr. Theon, *Progymn.* §3, Spengel, *Rh.Gr.* II, p. 73, 1–13 e Nicolaus Soph., *Progymn.* §1, Spengel, *Rh.Gr.* III, p. 452, 6–13: solo gli uomini infatti possono far ridere per le loro sciocchezze. Vedi su questo Hausrath 1909, 1720–21, con bibliografia.

²⁹ Nel testo di Aristofane questi versi sono contigui a quelli relativi ad Esopo che narra ai Delfici la storia dello scarabeo (*Vesp.* 1445–48).

³⁰ Sul valore da attribuire a queste testimonianze, v. Hausrath 1909, 1721–22.

³¹ Oltre ai passi sopra segnalati alla nota 28 indico, con riferimento alle testimonianze del Perry 1953, altri testi (per lo più di retori) in cui si distinguono le diverse tipologie delle fiabe, in base alla loro origine: *Schol. ad Aristoph. Aves* 471 (= T 5 Perry), Hermog. *Progymn.* 1 (= T 101 Perry), Aphth. *Progymn.* 1 (= T 102 Perry), Quint. *I.O.* V 11.19–21 (= T 98 Perry), Diogen., *Praef. CPG* I 180 (= T 89 Perry), Chamail. apud Hesych. s.v. Λιβυκοὶ λόγοι (= T 90 Perry), Isidorus, *Etymol.* I 40 (= T 64 Perry).

sembrerebbe alludere anche alla circolazione di un testo scritto di fiabe esopiche (*Aves* 471: οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας ὃς ἔφασκε λέγων ...). M. West è tra gli ultimi, autorevoli, sostenitori che in questo passo ci sia il riferimento a un'opera scritta e ritiene che, al fianco di una tradizione orale, già nel V sec. a.C. avesse preso forma letteraria la leggenda dello schiavo barbaro e narratore di favole, Esopo, e che all'interno di questa cornice biografica si inserissero le fiabe che il personaggio aveva raccontato in diversi momenti della sua vita.³² Un siffatto genere letterario va certamente collegato alla storia d'origine babilonese di Akicharos (il cui testo è venuto alla luce in un papiro aramaico del V secolo a.C. a Elefantina in Egitto) e su cui Teofrasto scrisse un libro (*Ἀκίχαρος α'*, DL V 50).³³

-Erodoto offre a mio avviso un significativo esempio di come una fiaba potesse inserirsi anche in testi di storiografia: narrando l'ambasceria degli Ioni e degli Eoli che, prima renitenti alla resa, solo dopo la sottomissione della Lidia da parte di Ciro chiedono di potersi arrendere alle stesse condizioni, lo storico riferisce che il re Persiano rispose loro con la fiaba dei pesci danzanti, per significare che, non essendosi arresi subito, le condizioni della resa non sarebbero più state favorevoli (*Her.* I.141 = F 11a Perry; cfr. F 11 Perry).

Certamente le fiabe della Lidia o di Sibari o della Caria avevano una forte tradizione orale: ma penso che alcuni testi storiografici, etnografici e le storie locali includessero qua e là delle fiabe tipiche di questa o di quella regione oppure favole raccontate dai protagonisti di alcune delle vicende narrate;³⁴ questa ipotetica via di trasmissione

³² West 1984, 105–28. Una precedente discussione del problema in Nøjgaard 1964, 467–79, che offre un quadro degli studi sull'argomento e, da parte sua, pur ammettendo l'esistenza di una collezione scritta di favole esopiche, respinge l'idea che in età pre-alessandrina circolasse una *Vita* di Esopo a cornice di alcune favole.

³³ Bibliografia essenziale su Akicharos: G. Wissowa, s.v. "Akicharos," *RE* I (1894) 1168, 21–39; Nau 1909; Ed. Meyer, *Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine* (Leipzig 1912); A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1923); A. Hausrath, *Achikar und Aesop. Das Verhältnis der orientalischen zur griechischen Fabeldichtung* (Heidelberg 1918); Perry 1953, 4–11; A. La Penna, *Il romanzo di Esopo*, cit., 264–313; M. L. West, "Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature," *HSCP* 73 (1969) 113–34; Id. 1984, in particolare 111ss; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 127–35. Luzzatto 1992. H. Wilsdorf, "Der Weise Achikaros bei Demokrit und Theophrast," *Philologus* 135 (1991) 191–206. N. Oettinger, "Achikars Weisheitssprüche im Licht älterer Fabeldichtung," in Holzberg 1992, 3–22; R. Kussl, "Achikar, Tinuphis und Aesop," in Holzberg 1992, 23–30. Altra bibliografia in Holzberg 1992, 176–78.

³⁴ Assai significative mi sembrano essere le parole del retore Teone (*Progymn.* §3, Spengel *Rh. Gr.* II, p. 73, 14–21). Il testo è citato nella nota 67.

scritta attraverso le storie locali può forse rendere ragione sia delle fiabe come λόγοι in prosa, sia del fatto che ci sono fiabe caratterizzate come λόγοι Λιβυκοί, Συβαριτικοί, Λυδικοί, ecc.³⁵

Peraltro il retore Teone ricorda l'uso della fiaba non solo da parte di Erodoto, ma anche degli storici Filisto e Teopompo: μύθου δὲ ὁποῖός ἐστι παρὰ Ἡροδότῳ τοῦ αὐλητοῦ, (ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ), καὶ παρὰ Φιλίστῳ τοῦ ἵππου [καὶ τῶν ἐν ἑκατέρῳ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ] ἐν τῇ δευτέρῃ (Theon, *Progymn.* §2 Spengel, *Rh. Gr.* II, p. 66, 9–11; Philistus, *F.Gr.Hist.* 556 F 6)³⁶ καὶ ἐν τῇ εἰκοστῇ Θεοπόμπου τῶν Φίλιππικῶν ὁ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τῆς ὕβρεως ὃν ὁ Φίλιππος διεξέρχεται πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοκράτορας τῶν Χαλκιδέων (Theon, *Progymn.* §2 Spengel, *Rh. Gr.* II, p. 66, 12–14; Theopompus, *F.Gr.Hist.* 115 F 127).

In sintesi, mi sembra che sia gli episodi della vita di Esopo contenenti le favole da lui raccontate in certe situazioni, sia le fiabe caratterizzate dai nomi di precise regioni geografiche possano rendere lecita l'ipotesi che alcuni testi storiografici della Ionia ne siano stati i primi canali di divulgazione scritta.

-Le fiabe potevano entrare anche in un discorso oratorio. Si sa infatti che in un discorso politico agli Ateniesi l'oratore Demade, cercando di richiamare l'attenzione distratta degli ascoltatori, inserì ad un certo punto una fiaba che definì esopica: dovendo Demetra, una rondine e un'anguilla guadares un fiume, la seconda volò, la terza s'immerse. Qui Demade interruppe il racconto e tacque il seguito: gli Ateniesi chiesero allora che cosa avesse fatto Demetra. L'oratore avrebbe risposto: "si arrabbiai con voi che, trascurando i problemi della città, antepone le favole di Esopo" (Demad. fr. XXII De Falco = F 63 Perry). Una tradizione attribuisce la narrazione di una favola anche a Demostene come espediente simile a quello di Demade per attirare l'attenzione degli ascoltatori (Ps. Plut. *Vitae X. or.* 848 A).³⁷ Cfr. inoltre Aristoph. *Vesp.* 563–66 e Lycurg. in *Leocr.* 95.

³⁵ T 85, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93 Perry.

³⁶ Riproduco il testo di F. Jacoby. Vedi le note critiche in *F.Gr.Hist.* III b Kommentar 556 F 6.

³⁷ Per il valore di queste testimonianze v. le parole di M. É. Chambry, *Ésope. Fables* (Paris 1927; 4th ed. 1985) XXX n. 1; V. De Falco, *Demade l'oratore. Testimonianze e Frammenti* (Napoli 1954), a commento del Fr. XXII. Id. 14ss., sottolinea che furono soprattutto i Peripatetici e in particolare Teofrasto a valorizzare l'oratoria di Demade.

Per la favola di Demostene vedi anche Suda, s.v. ὄνου σκιά nr. 400, III p. 543 Adler = Aristoteles fr. 457 Gigon. Vedi Demostene, *Sulla Pace* §25: è possibile che la tradizione del suo racconto della favola agli Ateniesi sia nata successivamente, come amplificazione delle sue parole in questa orazione.

-Amarono le favole anche filosofi come Socrate e Platone;³⁸ di Aristotele si è sopra parlato e poco più avanti considereremo l'interesse peripatetico per la favola.

-Le fiabe sono presenti, spesso con la veste di una semplice allusione, anche in poesia: negli esametri di Esiodo, nei giambi del *Margite*, di Archiloco, d'Ipponatte e di Semonide di Amorgo, nell'elegia di Solone e di Teognide, nella lirica di Alcmane, di Ibico, di Stesicoro e di Timocreonte, in anonimi *carmina simposialia*, nella commedia dorica di Dinoloco e in quella di Apollofane, di Archippo e di Aristofane, nelle tragedie di Aristia, di Eschilo e di Sofocle³⁹ (e l'elenco potrebbe certamente essere molto più ricco). La *Batrachomyomachia*, il piccolo poema in esametri su una battaglia tra rane e topi, prende spunto da una favola per offrire una parodia del mondo epico. Tuttavia la sua datazione è un problema ancora aperto; ci sono stati sostenitori del V sec. a.C., ma si propende ormai a vederne un prodotto della poetica alessandrina:⁴⁰ con i suoi 303 versi è troppo vasta per essere una fiaba, ma nasce certamente dall'elaborazione di un tema favolistico antico che entrerà anche nella *Vita di Esopo* (§133).⁴¹

§6. Quali sono le tipologie delle fiabe citate nei testi letterari prima della poesia alessandrina?

La risposta a questa domanda è qui necessariamente sintetica: la fiaba

³⁸ Plato, *Alc.* I 123A, cfr. F 142 Perry; *Phd.* 60B-C, cfr. F 445 Perry e *Phdr.* 259B-C = F 470 Perry, Xenoph. *Mem.* II 7.13-14 = F 356a Perry.

³⁹ I passi di alcuni di questi autori sono altrove citati nell'articolo; per non ripetermi mi limito qui ad aggiungere le citazioni a cui non ho fatto riferimento altrove (nel riferimento all'ed. Perry, ho segnato con F- la mancanza di un riscontro): -Alc. fr. 76 Page (segnalo che il contesto di Ael. *N.A.* XII.3 non è citato in modo completo dal Page ed il passo risulta così oscuro). -Apolloph., F 9 PCG Kassel-Austin II, p. 522 (= F 458 Perry). -Archil., fr. 201 West = 196 Tarditi. -Archipp., FF 35-36 PCG Kassel-Austin II, pp. 549-50. -Aristias 9 F 8 *TrGF* Snell I, p. 87 (= F 458 Perry). -Aristoph., fr. 192 Kock, *CAF* I, 437. -Dinol., F 8 Kaibel p. 150 (= F 458 Perry). -Hippon., fr. 92.10ss. West. -"Hom." *Margites* F 5 West (cfr. Plut. *An seni gerenda resp.* 12.790 c). -Ibyc. fr. 342 Page (= F 458 Perry). -Soph., *Ajax* 1142-49, F 331 Radt IV, p. 314 e F 362 Radt IV, p. 326 (= F-, - e 458 Perry); -*Skolion* 892 Page (cfr. F 196 Perry). -Theogn. 602 West (cfr. F 176 Perry). -Timocr. fr. 729 (cfr. F 17 Perry) e fr. 734 Page (= F 425 Perry).

⁴⁰ Per un utile *status quaestionis* sulla *Batrachomyomachia* vedi le pagine introduttive di [Omero] *La battaglia delle rane e dei topi*, a cura di Massimo Fusillo. Prefazione di Franco Montanari (Milano 1988) 39-43.

⁴¹ Sulle fiabe umoristiche di animali in lotta nell'antico Egitto vedi, in riferimento alla *Batrachomyomachia*, le parole di E. Brunner-Traut, *Altägyptische Märchen* (Köln 1983) (6. verbesserte Auflage) 266. Cfr. anche Nøjgaard 1964, 319. Da ultimo S. Merkle, "Die Fabel von Frosch und Maus," in Holzberg 1992, 110-27.

appare sempre come un testo molto breve, che s'inserisce nel contesto letterario per fornire una similitudine, un esempio o una eziologia.

La fiaba ha una vivace tradizione orale e può entrare sia in testi di prosa che poetici, in metri diversi. Le fiabe non sono limitate a un genere letterario specifico.

Quanto ai contenuti, *ci sono fiabe di vita animale, dove gli animali parlano e agiscono come uomini* (e.g. Hes. *Op.* 202–12 = F 4a e cfr. F 4 Perry; Arch. *Epod.* 171–81 West, cfr. F 1 Perry; Frr. 185–87 West, cfr. F 81 Perry; Aesch. *Myrmid.* F 139 Radt = F 276A e cfr. 276 Perry; Aristoph. *Aves* 471–75 = F 447 Perry). *Fiabe che hanno come protagonisti l'uomo e l'animale* (e.g. Her. I 141 = F 11a e cfr. 11 Perry; Stesich. ap. Arist. *Rhet.* II 20 1393b8ss. = F 269a e cfr. 269 Perry; Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1401–5 = F 423 Perry). *Fiabe in cui l'animale è in rapporto con Zeus o con un'altra divinità* (e.g. Sem. Am. fr. 13 West, Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1446ss; Pax 127–34, Lys. 695, cfr. F 3 Perry; Demad. fr. XXII De Falco = F 63 Perry). *Fiabe di metamorfosi* (e.g. Arist. *H.A.* 609a8–10; 616b5–7; 619a17–20 = F 422 Perry). *Fiabe di esseri umani in dialogo con oggetti* (e.g. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1427–32 = F 428 Perry). *Ci sono infine anche le "fiabe mitologiche"* (e.g. Plat. *Phaedo* 60B–C = F 445 Perry; Arist. *Meteor.* 356b10–17, cfr. F 8 Perry).

Eliano, *N.A.* VI 51 = F 458 Perry, narra la fiaba mitologica di Prometeo e c'informa che essa era entrata nella lirica di Ibico, nelle commedie di Dinocolo e di Apollofane, nelle tragedie di Sofocle e di Aristia: ci rivela così in modo esemplare come una medesima fiaba, adattata ai diversi contesti, potesse essere utilizzata in testi letterari di genere differente. Le fiabe sono dei testi "aperti" anche quando, parallelamente alla tradizione orale, vengono messe per iscritto.

L'interesse peripatetico per la fiaba

Prima di arrivare alla favola nella poesia alessandrina, dove è possibile che si riflettano alcuni dei materiali raccolti da Demetrio, può essere utile considerare le notizie che rivelano un interesse peripatetico per la fiaba precedente e contemporaneo al Falereo.

a) *I titoli delle opere.* Tra i lavori di Aristotele troviamo un Περὶ μυθολογουμένων ζώων α', "Un libro sugli animali favolosi" (DL V 25 = nr. 106 Gigon, senza testi). Il medesimo titolo compare anche tra le opere di Stratone di Lampsaco (DL V 59 = fr. 93 Wehrli, senza testi) il

quale, quasi sicuramente introdotto nella corte di Alessandria da Demetrio,⁴² fu precettore di Tolomeo Filadelfo (DL V 58). Sebbene nelle edizioni dei frammenti di Aristotele e Stratone questi titoli non siano seguiti da testi che ne illustrino i contenuti, alcuni passi aristotelici dell'*Historia Animalium*, in cui si descrivono i μυθολογούμενα ζῷα, mi fanno credere che nelle opere così intitolate si potesse parlare non solo di animali fantastici come per lo più si ritiene, ma anche di animali nella fiaba (Arist. *H.A.* 578b25–28 a proposito della lunga vita dei cervi; 609a8–10 sulle lotte tra animali, tipico tema favolistico; 619a17–20 a proposito degli uomini rei contro il dovere di ospitalità e tramutati in aquile).

Teofrasto fu autore del già citato libro Ἀκίχαρος α' (DL V 50 = 727 nr. 13 FHS&G), di cui non sono giunti frammenti, ma che certamente presentava una versione greca della storia del saggio assiro, di cui abbiamo un prezioso testimone aramaico nel papiro di Elefantina del V sec. a.C., e che ha strette analogie con la *Vita* e con alcune fiabe e sentenze di Esopo (vedi nota 33). Il Diels, *Vorsokr.*¹², 68 B 299 Demokritos, ritenne che l'opera Ἀκίχαρος di Teofrasto fosse la fonte del racconto (fittizio) tramandato da Clemente Alessandrino sulla traduzione in greco da parte di Democrito di una stele con la storia e le massime del saggio assiro Akicharos. Che invece Democrito conoscesse i testi di Akicharos è stato di recente sostenuto da M. J. Luzzatto e da H. Wilsdorf.⁴³ Qui non è forse inutile ricordare che i frammenti dossografici di Teofrasto testimoniano un forte interesse per Democrito.

Tra le opere teofrastees vorrei ricordare un altro titolo, ambiguo e pertanto di non sicura interpretazione: Λόγων συναγωγή α' (DL V 47), citata nell'edizione FHS&G nell'elenco degli scritti di logica con la traduzione "A collection of arguments" (68 nr. 37 FHS&G). Il termine λόγος è ambiguo, tanto che Teone matematico elenca almeno 15 significati di λόγος secondo i Peripatetici, tra cui anche ὁ Λιβυκὸς καὶ ὁ μῦθος καὶ ὁ αἶνος λόγος λέγεται.⁴⁴

Nella *Rhetorica* Aristotele dà istruzioni sull'uso della favola in oratoria.⁴⁵

⁴² Martini 1901, 2821, 45–51.

⁴³ v. *supra* e n. 33.

⁴⁴ Theon, *De utilitate math.* 72.24–73.11 Hiller.

⁴⁵ Arist. *Rhet.* 1393 a 23ss. V. *infra* l'esposizione del passo.

Nel Peripato esisteva dunque un interesse per la favola già prima di Demetrio, come mostrano i titoli delle opere sopra citate, sebbene non si tratti di vere e proprie “raccolte.”

Tuttavia, almeno nel caso dell'*Akicharos* di Teofrasto, venivano quasi sicuramente presentate in greco le favole e le massime di un personaggio dentro una cornice biografica (struttura che vedremo riflessa nel più tardo βίος di Esopo).

b) *La teoria peripatetica sulla fiaba*. Può essere utile rileggere alcuni passi della *Retorica* di Aristotele dedicati alla favola come forma di argomentazione.

Egli introduce il tema a proposito delle πίστεις, dicendo che sono due i tipi di argomentazione: gli esempi e gli entimemi; aggiunge che si distinguono anche due generi di esempio: l'esempio tratto da fatti realmente accaduti e quello inventato, come le parabole e i racconti esopici o libici, (*Rhet.* 1393a28–31). Seguono alcune parole sull'esempio di fatti realmente accaduti, poi la definizione di parabola o similitudine, infine l'illustrazione di due favole, una attribuita a Stesicoro e la seconda a Esopo (*Rhet.* 1393a31–b33, v. *supra*).

Interessanti le parole del filosofo quando afferma che le favole si adattano ai λόγοι δημηγορικοί e hanno questo vantaggio: mentre non è facile avere sempre a disposizione esempi tratti da avvenimenti realmente accaduti, è invece agevole fare esempi con le fiabe, perché, se si riescono a trovare le analogie, possono essere inventate sul momento. Per il discorso deliberativo, invece, è preferibile l'esempio di fatti storici (*Rhet.* 1394a1–18).

Parlando in seguito delle γνῶμαι, dirà che è sconveniente usare massime o raccontare favole se non si ha esperienza e un'età anziana (*Rhet.* 1395a1–7).

In sintesi, il passo aristotelico ci presenta la fiaba nel contesto di un discorso oratorio, mostrandoci il carattere aperto della sua tradizione: le fiabe, come le similitudini, possono essere inventate e adattate al discorso oratorio. Interessante inoltre l'osservazione che conviene raccontare favole in età anziana e il collegamento della fiaba al filone di cultura sapienziale delle γνῶμαι.

Alla scuola peripatetica risale la prima trattazione sistematica di fisiognomica, l'arte d'interpretare le strette relazioni tra i caratteri fisici e il comportamento degli individui: Aristotele nel *De gen. anim.* 769b18ss = Φυσιογνωμονικὸν α', nr. 109, fr. 352 Gigon testimonia la pratica di un fisiognomo che “riconduceva tutte le espressioni a quelle

di due o tre animali,” riconoscendo dunque delle analogie tra alcuni comportamenti umani e animali. Nel trattato *Φυσιогνωμικά*, attribuito ad Aristotele, ma più sicuramente solo di scuola peripatetica, si affronta criticamente la difficoltà d’interpretare in modo corretto le analogie tra i comportamenti degli animali e degli uomini che hanno caratteri fisici simili.⁴⁶ Credo che tale interesse fisiognomico del Peripato possa essere fruttuosamente collegato anche con quello di Demetrio per le favole: i fili conduttori di molti racconti sembrano originati proprio da un’acuta osservazione delle sottili analogie di comportamento tra certi uomini e certi animali e il forte messaggio etico delle favole è dato proprio dall’implicita similitudine tra questi due mondi, l’animale e l’umano. Buoni esempi di questo genere di fiaba fisiognomica si trovano in Semonide d’Amorgo (in particolare nel famoso catalogo dei dieci tipi di donne conservatoci da Stobeo = fr. 7 West) e in Callimaco (*Iamb.* II, fiaba attribuita a Esopo).

Demetrio ad Alessandria

Questi sembrerebbero essere dunque i precedenti della fiaba, prima degli *Aesopica* di Demetrio. Per cercare di ricostruire qualche tratto della sua opera perduta mi sembra necessario ora considerare la sua presenza ad Alessandria d’Egitto e vorrei farlo in relazione a due eventi: da una parte la grandiosa opera di collezione di libri per la Biblioteca del nuovo regno affidata proprio a Demetrio, dall’altra i richiami alla fiaba che s’incontrano nel grande poeta alessandrino Callimaco, teorico del genere *λεπτόν*.

La Biblioteca di Alessandria

La testimonianza di Aristeia (*Ep. ad Philocratem* I 9–11 = 59 SOD) pur presentando una lettura propagandistica giudaica degli avvenimenti e pur contenendo un riferimento anacronistico al regno di Tolomeo Filadelfo anziché a quello di Tolomeo Soter,⁴⁷ offre dei dati confermati in altre fonti sul ruolo avuto da Demetrio nella costituzione della nuova

⁴⁶ Per il testo vedi *Scriptores Physiognomonici Graeci et Latini*, vol. I, rec. R. Foester, 4–91 (Lipsiae 1893). Vedi J. Schmidt s.v. “Physiognomik,” *RE* XX¹ (1941) 1067–68. Utili le pagine introduttive di *Pseudo Aristotele. Fisiognomica. Anonimo Latino, Il trattato di fisiognomica. Introduzione*, traduzione e note di Giampiera Raina, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 5–51 (alle pagine 52–54 bibliografia) (Milano 1993).

⁴⁷ A. Pelletier, *Lettre d’Aristée a Philocrate* (Paris 1962) Intr. 47–58.

Biblioteca e che sembrano dunque avere un fondamento storico: Aristeia ci racconta che Demetrio ricevette denari dal re Tolomeo per raccogliere nel modo più completo possibile tutti i libri del mondo e che egli raggiunse questo scopo comprando libri e facendo fare trascrizioni.⁴⁸ Un passo di Strabone ci riferisce che Aristotele fu il primo ad aver fatto collezioni di testi (πρῶτος, ὦν ἴσμεν, συναγαγὼν βιβλία) e ad aver insegnato ai re egiziani come costituire una biblioteca (καὶ διδάξας τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ βασιλέας βιβλιοθήκης σύνταξιν):⁴⁹ naturalmente le parole sull'insegnamento di Aristotele devono essere intese, per evidenti ragioni cronologiche, come un riferimento non all'attività del grande maestro, ma piuttosto della sua scuola ed è facile per noi trovare qui una indiretta conferma della notizia sull'incarico dato da Tolomeo a Demetrio. Il numero dei libri raccolti nella Biblioteca era molto alto. Aristeia ci presenta il dialogo tra Demetrio e il Filadelfo preliminare alla decisione di far arrivare ad Alessandria anche testi giudaici, con un vivace scambio di battute: Tolomeo avrebbe domandato a Demetrio quante decine di migliaia di volumi erano state raccolte. La risposta sarebbe stata "più di 20" (cioè 200.000 volumi) con l'aggiunta: "Mi darò da fare per raggiungere il numero di 500.000." Tra i libri da acquistare ci sarebbero stati appunto anche le *Leggi* giudaiche. Anche se la notizia della traduzione del testo ebraico non ha fondamento storico, il numero dei volumi raccolti non è probabilmente molto lontano dalla realtà: lo *Scholion Plautinum* parla di 490.000 rotoli nella Biblioteca di Alessandria e 42.800 nella Biblioteca del Serapeo al tempo di Callimaco (in *Prolegomena de comoedia*, p. 48,6–49,2 Koster).⁵⁰ Varie testimonianze provano la presenza nella Biblioteca di volumi anche in lingua non greca, tra cui testi orientali.⁵¹

Demetrio fu dunque uno dei protagonisti principali di questo straordinario afflusso di libri ad Alessandria. Cicerone lo menziona tra

⁴⁸ Aristeia, *Ep. ad Philocratem* I 9–11 = 59 SOD: κατασταθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως βιβλιοθήκης Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐ χρηματίσθη πολλὰ διάφορα πρὸς τὸ συναγαγεῖν, εἰ δυνατόν, ἅπαντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην βιβλία, καὶ ποιούμενος ἀγορασμοὺς καὶ μεταγραφὰς ἐπὶ τέλος ἤγαγεν, ὅσον ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ, τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν.

⁴⁹ Strab. XIII. 1.54.

⁵⁰ R. Blum, *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnis bei den Griechen* (Frankfurt am Main 1977) 140–48 e *passim*. Vedi anche L. Canfora, *La biblioteca e il Museo*, in A.A.V.V., *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, Vol. I, tomo II (Roma 1993) 11–29.

⁵¹ Parsons 1952, 175–203.

gli uomini politici che esemplarmente occuparono il tempo dell'esilio a scrivere *multa praeclara* (Cic. *De Fin.* V 19.53 = 36 SOD): né si può dubitare che un uomo come il Falereo abbia avuto un interesse anche personale per i libri raccolti, che potrebbero essergli serviti come fonti per alcune opere composte in Egitto.⁵²

Data l'intensa attività politica ateniese di Demetrio prima dell'esilio egiziano, considerando la natura sapienziale delle favole (Aristotele ne aveva riservato l'uso all'età matura dell'uomo!) e il carattere compilatorio del libro definito da Diogene Laerzio λόγων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγή, la composizione di questa raccolta andrà datata verosimilmente negli anni "egiziani."⁵³ Ad Alessandria Demetrio aveva a disposizione un patrimonio di fonti molto ampio, in gran parte orientale, con tradizioni favolistiche diverse da quelle circolanti in Atene.

Callimaco

A questo punto consideriamo brevemente la favola nella poesia di Callimaco, il rappresentante del genere λεπτόν, attivo presso la corte tolemaica circa una generazione dopo il Falereo: nei *Giambi*, nell'*Hecale* e anche negli *Aitia* sono contenuti numerosi riferimenti alle favole, grazie alle quali il poeta dà un tocco leggero ad alcune sue metafore, soprattutto a quelle talora usate per rendere icastica, con gioco ironico, la propria polemica letteraria. Mi propongo di trattare in altra sede e con un'analisi più completa questi passi callimachei: qui richiamerò solo i punti più significativi.

1) Callimaco usa favole di tipo mitologico (*Iamb.* II), favole di vita animale (*Aitia* fr. 1, 31–34 e fr. 177; *Hecale* fr. 260 Pfeiffer) e, almeno in un caso, egli rende protagonisti di una piccola contesa due piante,

⁵² Martini 1901, 2821, 45–66.

⁵³ Perry (1962, 308) ritiene che Demetrio avesse composto gli *Aesopica* negli anni di governo ateniese, basandosi sulla menzione di una statua di Lisippo da parte di Agazia (AP 16.332): in questa scultura era raffigurato Esopo di fronte ai sette sapienti e, secondo il Perry, l'opera fu suggerita allo scultore dall'esistenza della raccolta di favole esopiche del Falereo. La tesi di un collegamento tra la scultura menzionata da Agazia e gli *Aesopica* di Demetrio è suggestiva e cronologicamente possibile, ma West 1969, 116 nota 6 riconosce che gli argomenti della datazione del Perry non sono molto forti. Non ha molto fondamento nemmeno la datazione proposta da L. Hermann ("Quelques Fables de Demetrios de Phalère," *L'Antiquité classique* 19 [1950] 5–11), che attribuisce l'opera di Demetrio agli anni 283–280 a.C., per il fatto che le favole sarebbero servite al Falereo come mezzo satirico per esprimere la sua opposizione contro Tolomeo Filadelfo, che lo aveva allontanato dalla corte di Alessandria.

l'olivo e l'alloro (*Iamb.* IV). Come abbiamo visto sopra, i primi due temi erano presenti già nei testi letterari di età arcaica e classica, mentre prima di Callimaco non abbiamo attestazioni greche per il terzo tipo.

2) Anche Callimaco allude talora a episodi della vita di Esopo:

Nel I *Giambo* (fr. 191 Pfeiffer) Ipponatte fa visita a Callimaco dall'Ade e gli narra la storia della coppa d'oro di Baticle (passata fra le mani dei sette sapienti e poi ritornata al primo, che la dedicò ad Apollo); nei versi 26–27 una folla di uomini è paragonata a sciami di vespe e di mosche e ai “Delfici di ritorno dal sacrificio.” Quest'ultima similitudine è chiarita dallo *Scolio Fiorentino* del giambo (PSI 1094 = T 26 Perry), che ricorda un episodio della vita di Esopo: egli beffeggiò i Delfici che, durante i sacrifici, si affollavano armati di coltelli per portarsi a casa porzioni della vittima. Lo scolio riferisce che i Delfici mal sopportarono questo rimprovero di Esopo e che lo presero a sassate, uccidendolo.

Si tratta di una versione della sua morte differente da quella in Aristofane, che allude alla sua morte a Delfi in seguito alla falsa accusa di aver rubato la coppa d'oro del Tempio di Apollo (*Vesp.* 1446 ss = T 20 Perry e *Schol. Vesp.* 1446 = T 21 Perry; *Pax* 129 ss = T 69 Perry).

Nel *Giambo* II Callimaco racconta la fiaba, di carattere mitologico, dell'età dell'oro: in questa epoca uomini e animali parlavano la stessa lingua, comprendendosi. Ma gli animali vollero qualcosa di più, liberarsi dalla vecchiaia, e accusarono Zeus di non essere stato giusto. Come punizione, la loro voce si differenziò e questa molteplicità di linguaggio venne data anche agli uomini: per questo, dice Callimaco, Eudemo parla la lingua di un cane, Filtone di un asino e i tragici parlano come i pesci. Il poeta conclude così: “queste cose le ha raccontate Esopo di Sardi, che i Delfici mal accolsero mentre raccontava una fiaba.” Questa ultima nota si collega evidentemente al tragico episodio della vita del favolista esposto nello *Scolio Fiorentino* del *Giambo* I.

Callimaco conferma dunque che la narrazione delle favole di Esopo era collegata a precisi episodi della sua vita e ripete la notizia che egli ebbe rapporti ostili con i Delfici.

Per quel che si sa egli è il primo a dire in questo giambo che Esopo era di Sardi (metropoli della Lidia).

Degno di nota è il carattere fisiognomico delle similitudini tra il linguaggio di Eudemo, di Filtone e dei tragici con i mezzi espressivi di altrettanti animali.

3) Nel *Giambo* IV Callimaco presenta anche una favola che attribuisce agli antichi Lidi: “Gli antichi Lidi raccontano che sul monte

Tmolo ci fu una lite tra un alloro e un olivo. ..." (fr. 194, 6–8 Pfeiffer). Segue la narrazione diretta della contesa verbale tra i due, con l'intervento finale di un rovo e un giuramento in nome del fiume lidio Pattolo.

Abbiamo qui il primo riferimento greco a "favole della Lidia": nella precedente tradizione avevamo visto attestate fiabe della Libia (Eschilo, Aristotele), di Sibari (Aristofane), della Caria e di Cipro (Timocreonte). Si ricordi che nel Giambo II anche Esopo, chiamato Σαρδηνός, è legato alla Lidia.⁵⁴

Inoltre, viene presentata per la prima volta una favola che ha come protagoniste le piante: già il Diels nel 1910 mostrò l'analogia della contesa tra l'alloro e l'olivo di Callimaco con la contesa tra il rovo e il melograno nel testo di Akicharos del papiro di Elefantina (Col. XI.165–66), riconoscendo in questo tipo di litigio tra alberi un più antico modello assiro-babilonese,⁵⁵ come fu confermato da studi successivi, come quelli dell'Ebeling,⁵⁶ del La Penna,⁵⁷ del West.⁵⁸ Fedro e Babrio, riassumendo nei loro Prologhi i temi delle favole esopiche, ricordano anche i racconti con alberi parlanti,⁵⁹ di cui noi non abbiamo nessuna attestazione nella letteratura greca prima di questa. Tali coincidenze potrebbero indurre a sospettare che nella raccolta di fiabe esopiche di Demetrio non dovessero mancare una o più fiabe del tipo vegetale.

Ad Alessandria Callimaco attingeva di prima mano ad un ricchissimo repertorio di fonti scritte. Tuttavia, dato che la tradizione delle fiabe era stata fino ad allora prevalentemente orale, riflettendosi solo qua e là, in modo sporadico, in testi letterari di molteplice e diversa natura, è lecito domandarci se l'opera di Demetrio, certamente disponibile ad Alessandria, potesse essere ignorata dal grande poeta-erudito.

Inducono a credere il contrario alcuni indizi presenti anzitutto nei Prologhi delle due importanti raccolte di favole di età imperiale, quella

⁵⁴ In questo Giambo colpisce il riferimento a puntuali elementi fisici della regione Lidia, come il monte Tmolo e il fiume Pattolo. Vedi, all'interno dell'erodoteo *Logos lidio*, i riferimenti al monte Tmolo in Her. I 84.3 e 93.1 e al fiume Pattolo in Her. V 101.2. Sul fiume Pattolo vedi anche Callim. fr. 814 Pfeiffer (*incerti auctoris*).

⁵⁵ H. Diels, "Orientalische Fabeln in griechischem Gewande," *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 4 (1910) 993–1002.

⁵⁶ Ebeling 1927, 3ss.

⁵⁷ La Penna 1964, 24–39.

⁵⁸ West 1969, 118–19.

⁵⁹ Phaedr. I Prol. 2–4; Babr. Prol. 9.

latina di Fedro e quella greca di Babrio. Entrambi i favolisti si richiamano all'autorità di Esopo, le cui fiabe hanno preso come modello, in gran parte riscrivendole, aumentandole di numero e soprattutto mettendole in versi. Essi, che certamente si basarono su una raccolta di favole che, se non era la stessa di Demetrio doveva perlomeno dipenderne, ci presentano nei Prologhi alcuni dei temi più tipici delle fiabe esopiche: così Fedro, nel Prologo del primo libro, dopo aver esordito con "Aesopus auctor quam materiam repperit, / hanc ego polivi versibus senariis" (1-2), conclude "calumniari si quis autem voluerit, / quod arbores loquantur, non tantum ferae / fictis iocari nos meminerit fabulis" (4-6).

Nel Prologo di Babrio leggiamo la medesima osservazione, espressa con maggiori dettagli: Babrio esordisce dicendo che gli uomini del suo tempo stanno vivendo nell'età del ferro, ma che precedentemente c'era una età dell'argento e prima ancora dell'oro (1-3): "Nell'età dell'oro anche tutti gli altri animali avevano una voce articolata e conoscevano le parole con cui noi parliamo l'un l'altro e nel mezzo delle foreste c'erano piazze del mercato. Il pino e le foglie dell'alloro chiacchieravano, chiacchierava—o Branco—il pesce con la nave e con il navigatore e i passerì conversavano con il contadino facendosi capire. Tutto cresceva dal terreno senza chiederlo e c'era amicizia tra uomini e dei. Tu potrai imparare e conoscere che così andavano le cose dal saggio e vecchio Esopo che narrò fiabe nella libera musa:⁶⁰ adornando di fiori ognuna di queste in base al mio ricordo, porrò per te un favo stillante di miele, addolcendo le dure membra dei pungenti giambi " (4-19).⁶¹

⁶⁰ Cioè in prosa. vedi la nota al testo greco della nota 61.

⁶¹ *Babrii Mythiambi Aesopei*, edd. M. J. Luzzatto et A. La Penna (Leipzig 1986) Prol. I:

Γενεὴ δικαίων ἦν τὸ πρῶτον ἀνθρώπων, / ὦ Βράγχε τέκνον, ἦν καλοῦσι χρυσεῖην, / μεθ' ἣν γενέσθαι φασὶν ἀργυρῇν ἄλλην, / τρίτη δ' ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐγένεθ' ἢ (γε) χαλκείη / μεμπτῆς σιδηρῆς ῥίζα †καὶ γένος χεῖρον†. / ἐπὶ τῆς δὲ χρυσῆς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ζώων / φωνὴν ἔναρθρον εἶχε καὶ λόγους ἦδει¹. / ἀγοραὶ δὲ τούτων ἦσαν ἐν μέσαις ὕλαις. / ἐλάλει δὲ πέτρη καὶ τὰ φύλλα τῆς πεύκης,² / ἐλάλει δὲ κίχθυσ, Βράγχε, νηὶ καὶ ναύτῃ, / στρουθοὶ δὲ συνετὰ πρὸς γεωργὸν ὠμίλουν. / ἐφύετ' ἐκ γῆς πάντα μηδὲν αἰτούσης, / θνητῶν δ' ὑπῆρχε καὶ θεῶν ἐταιρείη. / Μάθοις ἂν οὕτω ταῦτ' ἔχοντα καὶ γνοίης / ἐκ τοῦ σοφοῦ †τήμῶν† γέροντος Αἰσώπου³ / μύθους φράσαντος τῆς⁴ ἐλευθέρης⁵ μούσης. / ὦν νῦν ἕκαστον ἀνθίσας ἐμῇ μνήμῃ / μελισταγές σοι νοῦ τὸ κηρίον θήσω, / πικρῶν ἰάμβων σκληρὰ κῶλα θηλ(ύνας).

1. οἶους π(ε)ρ ἡμεῖς μυθεόμεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους: questo verso è riportato solo dal Π4 (Papyrus Bouriant 1 = P. Sorbonne inv. 826, IV sec.) ed è omesso nel testo dell'ed. Luzzatto-La Penna: in apparato leggiamo *La Penna dubitanter*. Il verso è invece accolto nell'edizione del Perry (T 95) e anch'io l'ho compreso nella mia traduzione.

Sia Fedro che Babrio affermano dunque che protagonisti delle fiabe di Esopo sono non solo animali, ma anche piante parlanti. In particolare Babrio sembra avvicinarsi molto alla fiaba mitologica che Callimaco, nel *Giambo* II, attribuisce a Esopo. Ma i temi presentati da Babrio non coincidono esattamente con quelli di Callimaco, cosicché piuttosto di ritenere che il favolista abbia come sua fonte esopica unicamente i *Giambi* II e IV del poeta di Cirene, sembrerebbe ragionevole supporre che ci sia stata per entrambi una fonte comune, quasi sicuramente in prosa, di cui forse facevano parte, tra le tante fiabe di Esopo, anche quelle di carattere mitologico e quelle con animali e piante parlanti.⁶²

Se così fosse, non parrebbe ingiustificato identificare tale fonte con la raccolta di Demetrio, nota forse non direttamente, ma attraverso antologie di età ellenistica (la tesi che le raccolte di Babrio e di Fedro dipendano, più o meno direttamente, dal libro di Demetrio, solleva la questione cruciale dell'entità di tale debito e soprattutto il problema se nel libro *Αἰσωπείων* α' le favole fossero già presentate nella forma tipicamente ellenistica dell'antologia, avulse da un contesto narrativo; su questo punto tornerò tra breve).

Un ulteriore collegamento tra Demetrio e Callimaco mi sembra suggerito da due altre coincidenze. 1) Pur non essendo fissi i nomi dei sette saggi ed esistendo al riguardo una tradizione molto varia e fluida,⁶³ i nomi di Talete, Biante, Periandro, Solone, Chilone, Pittaco e Cleobulo sono presenti sia nella lista di Demetrio (Stob. III 1,172 = Demetrius fr.

2. Luzzatto e La Penna hanno accolto la lezione di A (Cod. Athous Mus. Brit. Addit. 22087, sec. X). Nella traduzione ho preferito la lezione di Π4 πεύκη καὶ τὰ φύλλα τῆς δάφνης, accolta nelle edizioni Immisch e Perry.

3. Luzzatto-La Penna ammettono, in apparato, la possibilità di leggere la l.15: ἐκ τοῦ σοφοῦ τε καὶ γέροντος e nella mia traduzione ho seguito tale testo. Per le emendazioni di altri studiosi, vedi App. alla linea 15 nella sudetta edizione.

4. Non ho riportato nel testo l'emendazione di Luzzatto-La Penna che stampano οὐκ al posto di τῆς, correggendo così la lezione dei codd. D'altra parte lo stesso La Penna, in apparato, segnala che *tolerari posse lectionem traditam*, vedi App. alla linea 16.

5. ἐλευθέρης è emendazione del Crusius, accolta da successivi editori, quali il Perry e Luzzatto-La Penna. Il cod. A ha ἐλευθέρας, emendato dallo Schneidewin in παλαιτέρας. Il Crusius, *Babrii Fabulae Aesopeae* (Lipsiae 1897) 10 in App. alla linea 16 giustamente interpreta ἐλευθέρα in riferimento alla *oratione libera*, i.e. *soluta*.

⁶² Holzberg 1993, 57. Forse più direttamente condizionata dai *Giambi* di Callimaco potrebbe essere la scelta metrica di Babrio, che era consapevole di volgere in metro dei testi originariamente scritti in prosa.

⁶³ Importantissimi Barkowski, s.v. "Sieben Weisen," *RE* Zweite Reihe II [1923], coll. 2242-64 e B. Snell, *Leben und Meinungen der Sieben Weisen* (München 1938).

87 SOD), sia in Callimaco, nella leggenda della coppa di Baticle del *Giambo* I (il testo del papiro è corrotto, ma i nomi dei sapienti sono dati dalla *Dieg.* VI, vedi fr. 191 Pfeiffer), sia in Plutarco nel *La E di Delfi* e nel *Convivio dei Sette Sapienti* (nella prima opera Periandro è annoverato tra i sapienti, anche se criticato per la sua tirannide, nella seconda è sostituito da Anacarsi, evidentemente a causa dell'ostilità dell'autore per tale istituto politico).⁶⁴ 2) Lo stesso Plutarco, sempre nel *Convivio dei Sette Sapienti*, presenta Esopo partecipe al banchetto dei saggi come inviato del re Cresò di Lidia e da parte sua anche Callimaco chiama Esopo "Lidico."

Conclusioni sulla tradizione della fiaba e la raccolta di Demetrio

La tradizione della favola anteriormente all'*Αἰσωπείων α'* di Demetrio sembra essere stata vivace e varia. Le fiabe furono un elemento importante nella vita sia privata che civile e certamente dovevano essere, già dall'età antica, uno strumento di educazione del bambino e del giovane.⁶⁵ Uno stesso racconto poteva avere molteplici

⁶⁴ Nel *Convivio* di Plutarco i sette saggi sono rappresentati da Solone, Biantè, Talete, Anacarsi, Cleobulo, Pittaco e Chilone.

I nomi dei sette sapienti non sono fissi: la tradizione al riguardo è assai varia. Ermippo Callimacheo ne ricordava 17 possibili (DL I 42).

Colpisce dunque che la lista di Plutarco coincida con quella di Demetrio, con l'eccezione del tiranno Periandro, sostituito dallo scita Anacarsi. Nel *Convivio* Periandro è solo ospite del banchetto ed è tenuto distinto dai sapienti. In un dialogo dell'opera Talete dice di Periandro che "è colpito dalla tirannia come da un male ereditario" e che è solo la frequentazione dei saggi a tenerlo sulla retta via (§2 147C). Suppongo che dietro alla lista dei sette sapienti del *Convivio* ci possa essere l'autorevole tradizione di Demetrio, "corretta" in senso antitirannico forse da Plutarco stesso, che anche nel trattato *La E di Delfi* §3 385D-E nomina gli stessi sette sapienti della lista di Demetrio, in questo caso senza sostituzioni, ma con parole di critica verso Cleobulo e Periandro, a suo giudizio "rei" di essere stati tiranni e di essersi conquistati la fama di saggi solo con la forza e con le amicizie.

Il nome di Anacarsi compare nella lista dei diciassette savi di Ermippo Callimacheo e in quella di Ippoboto in compagnia di Orfeo, Lino, Solone, Periandro, Cleobulo, Misone, Talete, Biantè, Pittaco, Epicarmo e Pitagora (DL I 42). Su Anacarsi, vedi DL I 101-5.

⁶⁵ Sono testimoni dell'uso scolastico alcuni papiri del II-I saec. a.C.: vedi W. A. Oldfather, "An Aesopic Fable," in *Schoolboy's Exercise in Aegyptus* 10 (1929) 255-56; S. Daris, "Esercizio scolastico (favole esopiche)," *Aegyptus* 52 (1972) 91-96 e "Parodia epica e favola animalesca," *Aevum Antiquum* 4 (1991) 163-80. Per testi d'epoca più recente, vedi G. Zalateo, "Papiri scolastici," *Aegyptus* 41 (1961) 160-235, nrr. 175, 185, 195, 208, 254 e 359. Plut. *De Aud. poet.* 14 E 9 parla dell'importante

vie di trasmissione: oltre a godere di una diffusa tradizione orale, le favole entrarono anche nella letteratura, senza identificarsi però con nessuna forma letteraria definita.

Fra i generi letterari che dall'età arcaica accolsero le favole, un filone importante sembra essere stato quello in prosa. Gli antichi *Logoi* etnografici e le storie locali della Ionia forse ne contenevano un certo numero narrate da determinati personaggi in certe circostanze. Dionigi di Alicarnasso nel *De Thuc.* 5.2–3, dopo aver enumerato i nomi dei più antichi logografi, ricorda che essi sceglievano e trattavano i loro argomenti in modo molto simile, sia che parlassero di Greci che di barbari: non collegavano tra loro i racconti, ma li tenevano distinti per popoli e città, presentandoli in opere separate. Il loro unico scopo era questo: far conoscere a tutti, prendendole come erano, senza aggiungere né togliere nulla, le memorie conservate presso la gente del luogo, distinte per popolo e per città, oppure giacenti nei templi e nei luoghi profani. In queste memorie c'erano anche alcuni racconti a cui da molto tempo si credeva e alcune peripezie spettacolari che al tempo di Dionigi di Alicarnasso sembravano sciocche.⁶⁶

Questa testimonianza sulla tradizione logografica ed etnografica può essere fruttuosamente collegata con un passo di Teone che, oltre a Esopo, il migliore dei favolisti, ricorda anche il nome di altri personaggi meno noti, ma che narrarono fiabe: egli ce li presenta in ogni caso con il nome accompagnato dall'*ethnos*. Scrive: “(Le fiabe) vengono chiamate esopiche in modo generale, non perché Esopo sia stato il primo inventore delle favole (sembrano infatti conoscerle anche Omero, Archiloco e altri più vecchi di lui e invero vengono ricordati come favolisti anche Connis di Cilicia, Turos il sibarita e Cybisso di Libia),

ruolo delle favole nel *curriculum* educativo del suo tempo. Nei *Progymnasmata* di età imperiale un capitolo sul μῦθος apre in genere la trattazione: Hermog., *Progymn.* §1 in Spengel, *Rh.Gr.* II, pp. 3–4; Aphth., *Progymn.* §1 in Spengel, *Rh.Gr.* II, p. 21; Theon, *Progymn.* §3 in Spengel, *Rh.Gr.* II, pp. 72–78; Nicol., *Progymn.* §1 in Spengel, *Rh.Gr.* III, pp. 451–55.

⁶⁶ D.H. *De Thuc.* VII.5.2 : ... ἀλλὰ κατ' ἔθνη καὶ κατὰ πόλεις διαιροῦντες καὶ χωρὶς ἀλλήλων ἐκφέροντες, ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν φυλάττοντες σκοπόν, ὅσαι διεσφύζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνήμαι κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις, (ἥ) εἰ τ' ἐν ἱεροῖς εἴ τ' ἐν βεβήλοις ἀποκείμεναι γραφαί, ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἀπάντων γνῶσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν, οἷας παρέλαβον, μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτε ἀφαιροῦντες· ἐν αἷς καὶ μῦθοί τινες ἐνήσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ πεπιστευμένοι χρόνου καὶ θεατρικαί τινες περιπέτεια πολὺ τὸ ἡλίθιον ἔχειν τοῖς νῦν δοκοῦσαι (ed. G. Aujac [Paris 1991]).

ma per il fatto che Esopo le usò con maggior abbondanza e destrezza.”⁶⁷ Le ricorrenti testimonianze delle fiabe di Esopo, sempre legate a episodi della sua vita, i riferimenti a favole narrate da altri personaggi in precise occasioni (Ciro in Her. I 141 o Stesicoro in Arist. *Rhet.* 1393b10–22), la caratteristica indicazione dell’origine etnica di una fiaba e del suo narratore (oltre agli esempi di Teone, vedi *supra* i casi presentati al §4) inducono a sospettare che proprio la storiografia, specie attraverso i *Logoi* etnografici, abbia rappresentato un significativo canale di divulgazione delle fiabe scritte in prosa. “Since the tradition of public lectures given by Herodotus and Hippias of Elis is so well founded, it is sometimes taken for granted that the Ionian logographers also gained fame and wealth by lectures on historical subjects, and wandered from city to city like sophists”:⁶⁸ pare dunque che episodi della vita di Esopo potessero essere entrati in alcuni di questi *Logoi* e tale interpretazione tra l’altro può spiegare il fatto che sull’ἔθνος di Esopo esistano tradizioni differenti (T 4–7 Perry).

Credo che nella letteratura greca, prima di Demetrio, sia possibile cogliere testimonianze di una circolazione scritta di episodi della vita di Esopo uniti alla narrazione di favole, ma non di un suo βίος monografico.⁶⁹ Le parole οὐδ’ Αἰσωπον πεπάτηκας di Aristoph. *Aves* 471–72, difficili da interpretare, sembrano un elemento troppo debole a sostegno di questa seconda ipotesi.

M. West sospetta che la *Vita* di Esopo potesse esser stata composta nella città di Samo nel V sec. a.C.⁷⁰ e M. Adrados sostiene che proprio a Samo la leggenda di Esopo abbia potuto combinarsi con quella di Akicharos:⁷¹ entrambi gli studiosi presuppongono che nel V sec. a.C. potesse già essersi formato il libro con la leggenda biografica di Esopo a cornice delle sue favole, forse già strutturato sulla base del modello

⁶⁷ Theon, *Progymn.* §3 Spengel, *Rh. Gr.*, II p. 73, 14–21: Αἰσώπειοι δὲ ὀνομάζονται ὥς ἐπίπαν, οὐχ ὅτι Αἰσωπος πρῶτος εὐρετὴς τῶν μύθων ἐγένετο (“Ὅμηρος γὰρ καὶ Ἡσίοδος καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς πρεσβύτεροι γεγονότες αὐτοῦ φαίνονται ἐπιστάμενοι, καὶ δὴ καὶ Κόννις ὁ Κίλιξ, καὶ Θοῦρος ὁ Συβαρίτης, καὶ Κυβισσὸς ἐκ Λιβύης, μνημονεύονται ὑπὸ τινων ὡς μυθοποιοί), ἀλλ’ ὅτι Αἰσωπος αὐτοῖς μᾶλλον κατακόρως καὶ δεξιῶς ἐχρήσατο.

⁶⁸ L. Pearsons, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939 = Westport, CT 1975) 8.

⁶⁹ Così riconosce anche Holzberg 1993, 25.

⁷⁰ West 1984, 119–28 e la discussione seguente (129–36).

⁷¹ M. Adrados nella discussione dell’intervento di West citato nella nota precedente, a pagina 130.

orientale.⁷² La tesi è interessante, ma rimane nel campo delle ipotesi, mancandone le prove.

Cercando dunque un altro possibile contesto nel quale la tradizione del saggio orientale *Akicharos* avrebbe potuto incontrarsi con i racconti su Esopo, non si può non pensare proprio alla scuola peripatetica, dove era vivo l'interesse per la tradizione sapienziale, per i βίοι dei personaggi politici e letterari, per il mondo animale (considerato anche dal punto di vista fisiognomico e in rapporto alle fiabe); soprattutto sappiamo che Teofrasto compose una versione greca dell'*Akicharos*.

E' certamente significativo il fatto che Teofrasto, amico-maestro di Demetrio, scrisse tre libri di βίοι (Περὶ βίων α' β' γ', DL V 42 = 436 nr. 16 FHS&G), che il suo successore Stratone fu autore di un Περὶ βίων (DL V 59 = Straton fr. 18 Wehrli) e che Clearco di Soli, allievo di Aristotele e più giovane contemporaneo di Demetrio, scrisse a sua volta almeno otto libri di *Vite* (cfr. Clearchus, fr. 37–62 Wehrli). Demetrio stesso nei suoi scritti filologici ricercò le notizie biografiche dei poeti che stava studiando, come ben testimonia il fr. 144 SOD.⁷³ L'interesse per il filone della sapienza antica e per le figure dei sapienti è testimoniato in Teofrasto dai titoli di alcune opere: oltre all'*Ἀκίχαρος α'* (DL V 50 = 727 nr. 13 FHS&G), egli fu autore di un Περὶ σοφῶν α' (DL V 48 = 727 nr. 12 FHS&G), di un Περὶ γνώμης α' (DL V 46 = 666 nr. 7 FHS&G) e di un Περὶ παροιμιῶν α' (DL V 48 = 727 nr. 14 FHS&G). Teofrasto narrò la leggenda del tripode destinato all'uomo più sapiente, ma che nessuno dei sette savi volle trattenere presso di sé, facendolo passare di mano l'uno all'altro: il tripode partì da Biante, passò poi in mano a Talete e, alla fine del giro, una volta ritornato al primo, venne mandato a Delfi (Plut. *Solon* 4.7 = nr. 583 FHS&G). Plutarco aggiunge la notizia che, diversamente da Teofrasto, ci fu chi, al

⁷² Tuttavia West (1984, 120) scrive che "This does not necessarily mean that whenever someone refers to an Aesopic fable in the fifth-century Athens he is quoting from an established account of Aesop's life." Il West riconosce infatti che i riferimenti letterari, soprattutto di Aristofane, alludono a una pluralità di λόγοι esopici. Questo punto, ammesso dallo stesso West, mi sembra togliere forza alla tesi di una biografia già formata e strutturata come genere letterario nel V sec. a.C. e a noi testimoniata da Aristofane.

⁷³ Perry 1962, 303: "In a fragment of his lost book, *On Odyssey* 1–4, which is quoted by the scholiast on *Odyssey* 3.267 and by Eustathius, Demetrius sketches the biography of the earliest poets, deduced with Peripatetic precision from what had been said about them incidentally in Homer and other early poets, or to some extent, perhaps, by logographers before his time rationalizing on the same basis."

posto del tripode, parlò di una φιάλη inviata ai sapienti da Creso o anche di un ποτήριον fatto circolare da Baticle:⁷⁴ è certamente significativo che nel *Giambo* I di Callimaco sia narrata proprio quest'ultima versione della leggenda. Ancor più significativa, forse, la coincidenza che i saggi scelti da Callimaco siano esattamente i medesimi che Demetrio selezionò per i suoi Ἀποφθέγματα τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν (Stobaeus *Anth.* III 1.172 = fr. 87 SOD), opera che, assieme al Χρειῶν α' (DL V 81 = fr. 1 SOD), documenta l'interesse del Falereo per la letteratura legata alle figure dei Sapienti. Anche Clearco di Soli scrisse sui *Proverbi* (Παροιμίας, Clearchus, fr. 63–83 Wehrli), intervenendo a sua volta sulla leggenda del bicchiere passato di mano tra i sapienti.⁷⁵

Aristotele scrisse un libro di Παροιμίας (DL V 26) e si è già considerato il passo della *Rhetorica* in cui collegò le favole alle γνῶμαι (*Rhet.* 1394b–1395a).

La concentrazione di questi interessi all'interno della scuola Peripatetica ci presenta dunque un ambito nel quale, tra IV e III secolo a.C., la figura del favolista Esopo poteva venire facilmente connessa alla tradizione dei Sapienti in un libro che aveva come probabile modello orientale l'*Akicharos* divulgato in greco da Teofrasto (opera che sembra esser stata disponibile nella Biblioteca di Alessandria⁷⁶).

Per spiegare il libro Αἰσωπειῶν α' di Demetrio non è sufficiente considerare il clima culturale del Peripato: come già dissi, fondamentale è la sua presenza ad Alessandria. L'uso della favola da parte di Callimaco rivela non solo la simpatia del poeta, fautore della λεπτότης, per questo genere di racconti, ma anche l'ingresso nella sua poesia di

⁷⁴ Sulla complessa tradizione del tripode o della coppa passata di mano ai sapienti, vedi l'importante sintesi di Barkowski 1923, 2248–51.

⁷⁵ Secondo la testimonianza di DL I 30 Clearco di Soli scrisse che una φιάλη fu consegnata da Creso a Pittaco, iniziando così il giro tra le mani dei sapienti (Clearchus, fr. 70 Wehrli).

⁷⁶ Nella lunga lista di opere teofrasteie tramandata da DL V 42–50 furono riconosciuti da H. Usener (*Analecta Theophrastea*, Diss. Lipsiae 1858 = *Kleine Schriften* I [Leipzig and Berlin 1912] 50–87) quattro cataloghi: i primi due e il quarto sono redatti in ordine alfabetico, mentre non è riconoscibile nessun criterio nell'elenco delle opere del terzo gruppo. Il titolo Ἀκίχαρος è collocato, in ordine alfabetico, nel quarto catalogo (DL V 50 = 1.273 e 727.13 FHS&G). L'Usener dimostrò che l'ordine alfabetico di questi cataloghi risale ai sistemi di catalogazione della Biblioteca di Alessandria e, per restringere il cerchio, al lavoro di Ermippo, detto “Callimacheo” in quanto allievo di Callimaco (69–70).

una tradizione lidia su Esopo, prima sconosciuta, ma che si ritrova poi anche in successive tradizioni (vedi T 1, 3, 7, 35, 36 Perry).

Non si può escludere che Demetrio abbia avuto un certo ruolo nel recupero del filone storiografico o leggendario che connetteva Esopo alla Lidia, a Creso e alla leggenda dei sette sapienti. Proprio ad Alessandria si ebbe un forte afflusso di libri di antichi logografi della Ionia, non attraverso Atene, ma “by a direct route”;⁷⁷ è probabile che fosse arrivata anche una storia della Lidia contenente episodi che legavano Creso al favolista Esopo e forse anche ad alcuni dei sapienti del VI secolo.

Pensando all’opera sulle favole di Demetrio si parla sempre di “raccolta,” riprendendo il termine συναγωγή usato da Diogene Laerzio, ma assente nei titoli della lista delle sue opere.

In verità mi sembra che l’*Αἰσωπείων α’* di Demetrio potesse sì essere il frutto di un’accurata ricerca e una raccolta di materiali dispersi, ma che forse non sia corretto credere che con il termine συναγωγή Diogene Laerzio abbia voluto descrivere una sorta di antologia, intesa come insieme di testi avulsi da una loro cornice narrativa e presentati in una forma simile a quella della raccolta di favole del Papiro Rylands del I sec. d.C.⁷⁸ (nel quale il Perry riconobbe un testimone della perduta opera di Demetrio⁷⁹) o delle collezioni di Babrio e di Fedro: in genere, invece, si ritiene che Demetrio abbia composto la prima antologia di favole, prototipo delle più tarde sillogi.⁸⁰

Per quanto conosco, mi è difficile trovare già in una delle opere dei Peripatetici del IV–III secolo la forma dell’antologia letteraria, intendendo come tale una collezione di testi “scelti” ed estrapolati dal proprio contesto originario: un’opera del genere mi pare essere piuttosto un prodotto che nasce dall’erudizione ellenistica (cfr. e.g., i frammenti

⁷⁷ Pearson 1939, 9.

⁷⁸ C. H. Roberts, *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester 1938) III, 119–28, nr. 493.

⁷⁹ B. E. Perry, “The Origin of the Epimythium,” *TAPA* 71 (1940) 391–419; Id. 1962; Id, “Fable,” *Studium Generale* 12 (1959) 30; Id. 1965, Introduction, LXXXIV e nota 2.

⁸⁰ Oltre al Perry (*supra* nota 79), v. anche F. R. Adrados, “Les collections de fables à l’époque hellénistique et romaine in A A.V V. 1984, 165 e Discussion, 191–92, e Id. *Historia de la fábula greco-latina*, I:425–26 (qui Adrados applica il termine “antologia” a testi ellenistici di varia natura, spogliando così il termine dell’accezione che gli è propria). M. West, nella discussione dell’intervento di Adrados in A A.V V. (1984, 192) afferma, a proposito dell’opera di Demetrio: “His συναγωγή seems to have been a pioneering enterprise, and subsequent Hellenistic collections are likely to have been inspired by it and indebted to it.”

papiracei nrr. 1569, 1572, 1575, 1593, 1594, 1612, 1613 Pack²). Penso a opere di Aristotele, Teofrasto, Stratone, Demetrio e Clearco, per quel che le possiamo conoscere. Mi sembra che costoro abbiano avuto il criterio di cercare, raccogliere e classificare sempre con ἀκρίβεια documenti o materiali di natura scientifica, antiquaria, dottrinale o storico-letteraria, inserendoli poi nel contesto di propri ragionamenti o discorsi, spesso critici.

Potrebbero forse essere considerate eccezioni il libro aristotelico Διδασκαλία (Aristoteles, nr. 137 Gigon), i Νόμων κατὰ στοιχείον κδ' (DL V 44 = 589 nr. 17a FHS&G) o i Χαρακτῆρες di Teofrasto: si tratta infatti di opere con testi presentati secondo un certo ordine al di fuori di una cornice discorsiva; tuttavia la natura e soprattutto i contenuti di queste opere è molto diversa da quella di un'antologia di testi letterari e di favole. Nei primi due casi si tratta dell'esposizione dei dati di una ricerca antiquaria, nel terzo caso di una catalogazione di tipologie di difetti umani, distinti in base a lievissime sfumature (forse in base al criterio classificatorio κατὰ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον).⁸¹ I frammenti delle δημηγοριῶν τε καὶ πρεσβειῶν συναγωγαί di Demetrio (DL V 80; Demetrius, fr. 1, 2, 80, 82A–B, 83, 84, 85 SOD) non permettono di affermare che fossero raccolte di materiali presentati senza una cornice discorsiva.

Non mi sembra dunque che ci sia evidenza sufficiente per credere che l'Αἰσωπείων α' di Demetrio fosse, come voleva il Perry, un nudo e crudo "repertory of literary raw materials for the use of writers and speakers,"⁸² né che possa essere corretto chiamarla "antologia."⁸³

Mi pare che le raccolte antologiche di fiabe del tipo testimoniato dal Pap. Ryl. del I sec. d.C. possano essere testimoni della fortuna delle favole in età ellenistica: è probabile che in quest'epoca siano avvenute le prime estrapolazioni di favole dalla raccolta di Demetrio, per un uso scolastico⁸⁴ e retorico.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Sulla originaria natura dei *Caratteri*, forse ora difficilmente riconoscibile a causa delle vicende del testo in età tardo-antica e medioevale, vedi E. Matelli, "Conservazione e selezione dei testi teofrastei in età tardo-antica: il caso dei *Caratteri*," in *Esegesi, Parafrasi e compilazione in età tardo-antica*, Atti del Terzo Convegno dell'associazione di Studi Tardoantichi, 273–85.

⁸² Perry 1965, Introduction LXXXV nota 2.

⁸³ Adrados 1984, 425–26.

⁸⁴ Vedi *supra* nota 65.

⁸⁵ Questa è l'opinione del primo editore del Pap. Ryl., C. H. Roberts 1938, III, nr. 493, p. 121.

Sembrerebbe così forse più realistico pensare che la raccolta di Demetrio, composta probabilmente negli anni del suo soggiorno ad Alessandria (quindi circa nel primo decennio del III sec. a.C.), presentasse, secondo la tradizione, un certo numero di fiabe inserite in un proprio contesto: non doveva certamente mancare, nella presentazione dei testi, un metodo critico e una ricerca antiquaria tipici del Peripato e della nuova civiltà alessandrina (e forse riflessi anche in un βίος di Esopo).

Il titolo Αἰσωπείων α' rivela che Demetrio volle definire le sue fiabe proprio in riferimento alla figura di Esopo e non agli altri rami della tradizione favolistica. Per quanto riguarda le dimensioni del libro, vorrei ricordare le problematiche parole con cui Diogene Laerzio introduce l'elenco delle opere del Falereo: πλήθει δὲ βιβλίων καὶ ἀριθμῷ στίχων σχεδὸν ἅπαντας παρελήλακε τοὺς καθ' αὐτὸν Περιπατητικούς. Così è probabile che la raccolta di fiabe di Demetrio fosse un libro di ampia consistenza, pur non contenendo forse un gran numero di favole (tra 50 e 100 secondo Perry).⁸⁶ Quasi sicuramente nel proporre le fiabe di Esopo ed esopiche egli "riscrisse" in prosa tutti i testi delle sue fonti, uniformandone lo stile.⁸⁷ Ma forse la sua raccolta comprendeva un materiale anche più ricco.

Come dissi all'inizio, il titolo Αἰσωπείων α' e non Αἰσώπου λόγων α' può farci sospettare che la raccolta di favole di Demetrio contenesse non solo favole "di Esopo," ma anche favole "esopiche," cioè liberamente costruite su alcuni modelli del favolista del VI secolo. Se così fu, mi sembra che nella sua raccolta Demetrio colse in modo preciso la natura della favola e in particolare della favola esopica.

Esopo infatti per lo più non aveva "inventato" fiabe, ma raccontato con particolare *verve* racconti più antichi, adattandoli a nuove situazioni.⁸⁸ Che le favole fossero dei testi "aperti" lo aveva teorizzato

⁸⁶ Perry 1962, 334; Adrados 1984, 421–508; Nøjgaard nella Discussione dell'intervento di Adrados in A A.V V. 1984, 190. Tuttavia del numero effettivo di favole non sappiamo nulla.

⁸⁷ I favolisti di età imperiale si vantano di mettere in versi la musa pedestre di Esopo ed è dunque verosimile e generalmente riconosciuto che anche la raccolta di Demetrio presentasse i testi delle favole in prosa. Per lo stile dell'opera, v. Perry 1962, 343ss.

Per il metodo aristotelico di "riscrittura" dei testi delle sue fonti, vedi le parole di Gigon 1987, 389 nell'introduzione del nr. 77 (Τεχνῶν συναγωγή α' β').

⁸⁸ Αἴσωπος αὐτοῖς μᾶλλον κατακόρως καὶ δεξιῶς ἐχρήσατο (Theon, *Progymn.* §3, Spengel II, *Rh.Gr.*, p. 73, 20–21). Per una citazione più completa del passo vedi *supra* nota 67.

Aristotele nella sua *Retorica*, ma è soprattutto la storia della fiaba a dimostrarlo.⁸⁹ Nei versi 652–54 degli *Uccelli*, Aristofane cita il racconto della volpe e dell'aquila⁹⁰ introducendolo come una delle favole di Esopo (ὅρα νῦν ὡς ἐν Αἰσώπου λόγοις ...;) e lo scolio al passo nota che le fiabe vengono correttamente (σαφῶς) attribuite ad Esopo, anche questa che pure era già stata raccontata da Archiloco, più vecchio di Esopo.⁹¹ Analogo è il caso della fiaba dello scarabeo e dell'aquila che Aristofane attribuisce a Esopo in risposta ad un'ingiusta accusa, ma che noi sappiamo esser già stata raccontata nei giambi di Semonide.⁹²

L'interesse prioritario della raccolta di Demetrio era certamente di recuperare quel patrimonio di favole e di sapienza che, pur disperso e fluido, era legato alla figura di Esopo e i casi della sua vita; ma non escludo che, proprio in coerenza con la tradizione aperta della fiaba, egli potesse averne dimostrato la vitalità accogliendo anche materiali di “fresca” composizione.⁹³

Mi sembra di poter ipotizzare che il libro Αἰσωπείων α' potesse contenere al tempo stesso elementi tradizionali ed elementi di novità rispetto al passato: così se da una parte penso che le fiabe di Esopo non fossero disgiunte dal contesto biografico che le avevano originate, credo anche che Demetrio possa talora aver aggiunto al racconto delle favole anche una spiegazione del loro significato (aprendo in un certo senso la strada ai successivi *promythia* ed *epimythia* che caratterizzano la presentazione delle fiabe avulse dal proprio contesto nelle successive antologie). Tale necessità di spiegare e razionalizzare i contenuti metaforici di un testo mi sembra coerente con l'educazione filosofica di Demetrio. Vorrei citare a sostegno di questa ipotesi un frammento

⁸⁹ “Favole esopiche” sono create da Socrate (Plato *Phaedo* 60c: Καί μοι δοκεῖ, ἔφη, εἰ ἐνενόησεν αὐτὰ Αἴσωπος, μῦθον ἂν συνθεῖναι ὡς ...), dall'oratore Demade (Fr. XXII De Falco) e forse anche di Demostene (Ps. Plut. *Vitae X or.* 848A). Cfr. anche Aristofane, *Vesp.* 1258–60: (... ἡ λόγον ἔλεξας αὐτὸς ἀστεῖόν τινα, / Αἰσωπικὸν γέλοιον ἢ Συβαριτικόν, / ὧν ἔμαθες ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ).

⁹⁰ Cfr. F 1 Perry.

⁹¹ *Schol. in Aristoph. Aves* 651 (Dübner): “Ὅτι σαφῶς ἀνέτιθεςαν Αἰσώπῳ τοὺς λόγους, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν παρὰ τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ λεγόμενον, καίτοι πρεσβυτέρῳ ὄντι. Vedi anche lo *Schol. Il.* T 407c, citato alla nota 17.

⁹² Semonides fr. 13 West e Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1446–49, *Pax* 127–34, *Lys.* 695.

⁹³ Non escluderei ad esempio che Demetrio, il quale aveva svolto un'intensa attività politica ad Atene prima dell'esilio in Egitto, in alcune occasioni avesse usato, forse adattandole alle proprie necessità, alcune favole “esopiche,” o che anche ne avesse inventate di nuove sempre sul medesimo modello, facendole poi entrare nel suo Αἰσωπείων α'.

teofrasteo nel quale il filosofo cerca di “spiegare” il mito di Poseidone che donò il fuoco agli uomini interpretandolo come una metafora del suo dono della filosofia: Θεόφραστος δὲ τὸν Προμηθέα φησὶ σοφὸν γένόμενον μεταδοῦναι πρῶτον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις φιλοσοφίας, ὅθεν καὶ διαδοθῆναι τὸν μῦθον, ὥς ἄρα πυρὸς μεταδοίη (729 FHS&G).⁹⁴

Vorrei concludere sottolineando che ad Alessandria ci fu certamente un fruttuoso incontro tra i metodi peripatetici di ricerca antiquaria, lo straordinario afflusso di libri, la nascita dell'erudizione libraria e il desiderio di una nuova poesia. Credo che proprio qui Demetrio possa aver composto l'opera, unendo gli stimoli della sua esperienza peripatetica al nuovo clima culturale del Regno d'Egitto. La considerevole accoglienza della fiaba da parte della poesia ellenistica ispirata al λεπτὸν mi porta a sospettare che l'iniziativa di Demetrio non fosse estranea alle esigenze della nuova poetica alessandrina, a cui dava e da cui al tempo stesso riceveva un forte stimolo.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Il frammento teofrasteo è pubblicato nel capitolo *Miscellanea*, sezione *Reperta et incepta* dell'ed. FHS&G nr. 729: credo che esso possa essere messo in relazione con l'opera Περὶ σοφῶν α' (DL V 48 = 727 nr. 12 FHS&G).

⁹⁵ E. Livrea, *Da Callimaco a Nonno. Dieci studi di poesia ellenistica* (Messina e Firenze 1995) 62 nota 10: “Quanto la poetica callimachea deva all'aristotelismo e in particolare al περὶ λέξεως di Teofrasto è problema tuttora nemmeno sfiorato dall'indagine filologica.” Ma a sua volta anche la ricerca peripatetica della generazione successiva al caposcuola sembra aver ricevuto fruttuosi stimoli dal contatto con il nuovo centro di cultura ad Alessandria.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Index of Ancient Sources

for Articles 2–8

AELIANUS		fr. 176	427 n.39
<i>De natura animalium</i>		fr. 196	427 n.39
5.51	428	fr. 269, 269a	423
12.3	419 n.17, 427 n.39	fr. 276	423, 428
<i>Varia Historia</i>		fr. 276a	423, 428
3.17	343 n. 56	fr. 356a	427 n.38
9.9	312, 317	fr. 422	428
12.43	314	fr. 423	422, 428
		fr. 425	427 n.39
AESCHYLUS		fr. 427	423
<i>Agamemnon</i>		fr. 428	428
699–708 Fraenkel	421	fr. 445	427 n.38, 428
717–36	421	fr. 458	427 n.39, 428
<i>Myrmidones</i>		fr. 470	427 n.38
fr. 139 Radt	423, 428	T 1 Perry	443
		T 3	443
		T 4	440
AESOPUS		T 5	424 n.31, 440
<i>Aesopica</i>		T 6	440
fr. 1 Perry	428, 446 n.90	T 7	440, 443
fr. 3	420 n.20, 422, 428	T 20	422, 434
fr. 4, fr. 4a	428	T 21	434
fr. 8	428	T 26	434
fr. 11	425	T 35	443
fr. 17	427 n.39	T 36	443
fr. 63	426, 428	T 41	423
fr. 81	428	T 64	424 n.31
fr. 87	420 n.19	T 69	422, 434
fr. 142	421 n.21, 427 n.38		

T 85	426 n.35	APOLLOPHANES	
T 88	426 n.35	F 9 PCG II, p. 522	
T 89	424 n.3, 426 n.35	Kassel-Austin	427 n.39
T 90	424 n.31, 426 n.35		
T 92	426 n.35	ARCHILOCHUS	
T 93	426 n.35	fr. 171–81 West	419 n.8, 428
T 94	423	fr. 174	419, 419 n.17
T 95	436 n.61	fr. 185–7	427 n.39
T 98	424 n.31	fr. 201	427 n.39
T 101, 102	424 n.31		
AGATHIAS		ARCHIPPUS	
<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>		fr. 35–6 PCG II, pp. 549–	
16.332	433 n.53	50 Kassel-Austin	427 n.39
ALCAEUS		ARISTEAS	
fr. 76 Page	427 n.39	<i>Epistula ad Philocratem</i>	
		9–11	343 n. 58, 345,
			376 n.24, 431, 432 n.48
ALEXIS		ARISTIAS	
fr. 327 Kock	375 n.22	<i>TrGF</i> 9 F 8 Snell	427 n.39
ap. Athen. 13.610F	320 n.26		
AMMONIOS GRAMMATICUS		ARISTOPHANES	
Πρὸς Ἀθηνοκλέα	401	BYZANTINUS	
		fr. 369 Slater	392 n.4
ANECDOTA. GR. OXON.			
2.239	322	ARISTOPHANES COMICUS	
ANONYMUS DE COMOEDIA		<i>Aves</i>	
13 p. 9 Kaibel	392 n.5	471–5	419 n.15, 425,
			428, 440
		652–4	446
ANTIPHANES		<i>Pax</i>	
T 5, 6, 7 PCG	392 n.4	27	420 n.20
		127–34	422, 422 n.25,
			428, 446 n.92
APHTHONIUS		<i>Lysistrata</i>	
<i>Progymnasmata</i>		695	420 n.20, 422,
1 <i>RhGr</i> II, p. 21			428, 446 n.92
Spengel	439 n.65		

<i>Vespaie</i>		3.12, 1413b9	383 n.11
563–6	426	<i>Poetica</i>	406
1220	314	4.4, 1448b27ff.	409
1258–60	424, 446 n.89	17, 1455b16–23	405
1401–5	428	Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία	
1427–40	424, 428	42.1	317
1446–9	420 n.20, 422,	7.2	364 n. 43
	422 n.23, 434, 446 n.92	61	335 n. 17
fr. 192	427 n.39	Δελφῶν Πολιτεία	
		nr. 37, fr. 494, 1–3 Gigon	417
ARISTOTELES		Διδασκαλία	444
<i>Meteorologica</i>		Μενώνεια	
II.3 356b10–17	423, 428	nr. 110, fr. 353 Gigon	417
<i>Historia animalium</i>		Περὶ μυθολογουμένων ζῶν α'	
578b25–8	429	nr. 106 Gigon	428
609a8–10	428, 429	Περὶ τῆς Ἀρχυτείου	
616b5–7	428	φιλοσοφίας	
619a17–20	428, 429	nr. 92 Gigon	417
<i>De Generatione animalium</i>		Σαμίων πολιτεία	
769b18ss.	430	fr. 591,1 Gigon	423
<i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>		Συναγωγῆς α'β'	
10.9, 1181b6–23	355	a n b v (DL V 24)	417
10.9, 1181b6–12	417	Τέχνης τῆς Θεοδέκτου	
<i>Politica</i>	377	συναγωγή α'	417
4–6	378	Τεχνῶν συναγωγή α'	417
4.1–2	380 n.38	Φυσιогνωμονικὸν α'	
4.11, esp. 1295b34ff.	378 n.5	nr. 109, fr. 352 Gigon	430
5.1, 1302a14ff.	378 n.31		
5.7, 1307a11ff	378 n.31	[ARISTOTELES]	
5.8, 1309a14ff.	378	<i>Oeconomica</i>	
<i>Rhetorica</i>		I 6.3, 1345a2–5	424 n.27
1393a23ss.	429 n.45	ARISTOXENUS	
1393a28–b33	423, 428, 430,	fr. 123 W.	407, 407 n.36
	440		
1394a1–18	430	ARRIANUS	
1394b–1395a	442	<i>Diadochoi</i>	
1395a1–7	430	13	315 n.10
3.1, 1403b22ff.	383 n. 9		

ARTEMIDORUS

Onirocriticon

2.44 316 n.16

ATHENAEUS

Deipnosophistae

1.3A–B 344 nn. 62, 64

3.120 402 n.28

4.167E–F 323

4.167F 336 n. 20

4.174B 400

5.177C 400

5.177E–F 393, 394, 399

10.422C 312

11.508f. 375 n.19

11.508F 320 n.26

12.542 334 n. 10

12.542B–E 316

12.542B 312

12.542D 350

12.542E 315 n.11, 319

12.543E 315 n.10

12.543F 315

13.577C, E 322

13.593 334 n. 10

13.593F 316

13.610f. 375 n.19

13.610E 375 n.22

14.620B 342 n. 49

14.662f. 392 n.4

BABRIUS

Mithiambi Aesopei

Prol. 1–19 436, 436 n.61

Prol. 9 435 n.59

CALLIMACHUS

Aitia

fr. 1, 31–4 Pfeiffer 433

Hecala

fr. 260 433

Iambi

I 434, 438, 442

II 431, 433, 435, 437

IV 434, 437

Fragmenta incerti auctoris

fr. 814 435 n.54

CARYSTIUS

ap. Athen. 12.543E 315 n.10

CICERO

Brutus

9.37 383 n.8

De finibus

5.19.53 319, 343 n. 52, 433

De legibus

2.63ff. 370 n.9, 379 n.35

2.64–66 334 n. 10, 350

3.6.14 333 n.6, 383 n.8

3.14 354 n. 18

De officiis

1.1.3 383 n.8

2.56 371 n.12

De oratore

1.14.62 382 n.4

De re publica

2.1.2 349

Pro Rabirio Postumo

23 326, 345 n. 67, 373 n.18

CLEARCHUS

frr. 37–62 W. 441

frr. 63–83 442, 442 n.75

CRITOLAUS

frr. 5–10 W. 368

DEMADES	29	319 n.22, 320 n.27
fr. XXII De Falco	426, 30	319 n.22, 320 n.27, 371 n.11
428, 446 n.89	31	312, 318
DEMETRIUS IXION	32–3	371 n.13
Ostermann fr. 58–62	393 33A	312
	36	319, 433
DEMETRIUS MAGNESSUS	37	381, 386, 386 n.24
<i>De poetis</i>	328, 328 n.57 38	372 n.17
	39	322 n.33
DEMETRIUS PHALEREUS	40	322 n.33
<i>Fragmenta</i>	41	387 n.31
1 SOD	312–328, 348, 42	326, 373 n.18
	351 n.8, 371 n.12, 43	315, 315 n.10, 371 n.11, 378 n.29
	374 n.19, 376 n.25, 43A–B	312, 316, 350
	377, 387 n.32, 391 n.2, 43A	319
	392 n.4, 403 n.31, 415, 44	312
	442, 444 45	319 n.22
1–2	377 48–9	371 n.13
2	314, 316, 322, 444 50	371 n.12
4	314 52	349
5	316 53	350, 374, 379 n.35
6	322 54	371 n.12
7	323 56	349
12	315, 385 n.17 57	354 n.18, 368, 383 n.8
13A–B	382, 384 n.14 58	372 n.17
13A	315 n.10, 351 n.8 58A	322 n.33, 349
13B	374 58B	376 n.24
14	325 59	322 n.33, 372 n.17, 376 n.24, 414 n.3, 431, 432 n.48
15A–B	318 61–3	322 n.33
16A–B	370 n.7 62	391 n.1
16B	349 65–6	376, 396
18	355 80	377, 444
19	318, 351 n.8, 374 82A–B	374, 444
20A–B	349 82–5	377
24A–C	318 83	444
25A	318	
25B	318, 319 n.23	
25C	318	

84	444	141	381, 383
85	322, 444	142	381, 383
86	316 n.16, 376	143–6	376, 377, 392 n.3
87	323 n.39, 377, 418, 438, 442	143	393, 394, 399
		144–6	394
89	351 n.8, 372 n.14, 374, 378 n.29	144	406, 441
		145	403
92–4	376 n.25	146	406, 409
93	377	147	391 n.1
95–101	376	155	376 n.25
95	351 n.8	156	351 n.8, 374
96B	350	157	394
97	350	158	396
98–101	351 n.8	162	318
102–9	363 n.41	164	351 n.8, 374
103–9	377	170–3	393 n.11
103	376 n.25	174	393
105–8	376	175	393 n.11
109	376 n.25	Ἀθηναίων καταδρομή	324, 374
110	351 nn.8, 9, 371 n.12, 374	Ἀισωπείων α΄	437, 442, 445, 446, 446 n.95
115–17	351 n.8	Ἀισώπου λόγων α΄	445
115	351 n.9, 374, 378 n.29	Ἀποφθέγματα τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν	442
116A–B	374	Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή	376
119	383 n.8	Ὀμηρικός	392, 399
120ff.	374	Περὶ Ἀντιφάνους	392
121	380, 383 n.8	Περὶ Ἰλιάδος	391, 399
125	313	Περὶ μεγαλοψυχίας	377
130–2	381	Περὶ νόμων	327, 349, 349 n.5
130–41	377	Περὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας	391, 399
130	382	1–4	44 n.73
131A–C	384	Περὶ ὀνείρων	376
131A	385	Περὶ ῥητορικῆς	377, 399
131C	384 n.15	Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας	349, 376
132	382	Περὶ τῆς δεκαετίας	324, 374
133	377, 397, 398, 399	Περὶ τῆς τύχης	324, 374
134	381, 383, 383 n.11	Περὶ τοῦ δόκου	373
135 A–B	388 n.36, 392 n.5		
135C	388 n.34		

Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι πολιτειῶν	349	DIO CHRYSOSTOMUS	
Περὶ φυγῆς	326	<i>Orationes</i>	
Πτολεμαῖος ἁ	327	37.41	318, 333 n.5
Σωκράτους ἀπολογία	363 n.41, 374, 376	53	399 n.21
Τὰ περὶ ποιητῶν	391	DIODORUS SICULUS	
Τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν		<i>Bibliotheca</i>	
ἀποφθέγματα	323 n.39	18.18.2–3	315
Ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτείας	349, 374	18.64.1ff.	319
Χρειῶν ἁ		18.74	370 n.7
5.81	323 n.39, 442	18.74.3	333 n. 8; 337 nn. 26, 28; 339 n. 33
DEMETRIUS RHETOR		19.78.4	339 n. 35
<i>De elocutione</i>		20.45.2	371
289	315, 385 n.17	20.45.3	336 n. 24
DEMOCHARES		DIOGENES LAERTIUS	
ap. Polyb. 12.13.7	372 n.14	<i>Vitae philosophorum</i>	
<i>Orat. Att.</i>		1.22	312
2.34	375 n.19	1.30	442 n.75
DEMOCRITUS		1.38	312, 328 n.57
68 B 299 D-K	429	1.42	438 n.64
DEMOSTHENES		1.49	312
<i>Orationes</i>		1.67	312
29.23, 58	314	1.72	325 n.45
[DEMOSTHENES]		1.74–5	312
43.62	379 n.35	1.79	328 n.57
DICAEARCHUS		1.82	312
fr. 42 W.	398 n.20	1.89	312
fr. 92	404 n.32	1.95	312, 326
fr. 93	406, 407 n.36	1.101–5	438 n.64
DINOLOCHUS		1.101	312
F 8 Kaibel 150	427 n.39	1.106–7	312
		1.119	312
		2.13	325 n.45
		2.19	312
		2.44	312
		2.56	326 n.49
		2.63	326 n.49

2.84	312	5.59	428, 441
2.109	325 n.45	5.62	368
2.112	326	5.75–85	311, 349
2.120	325 n.45	5.75	312, 314, 317, 318, 321,
2.142	325 n.45, 326		324, 333 nn. 5, 9
3.2	325 n.45	5.76	312, 316, 318, 319,
3.23	326 n.49		322, 334 n. 10
3.34	326 n.49	5.77	318
3.38	398 n.20	5.78–9	387 n.32
4	385 n.18	5.78	312, 320, 321, 325,
4.3	326		325 n.45, 343 n. 54,
4.9	315		345 n. 67, 373 n.18,
4.14	386 n.27		403 n.31
4.44	325 n.45	5.79	320, 321
5.4	379 n.36	5.80–1	327, 340 n. 39, 392
5.11–17	344 n. 62	5.80	328, 336 n. 23, 386,
5.17–21	323 n.38		415, 416, 442, 444
5.24	417	5.81	323 n.39, 343 n.51, 415,
5.25	417, 428		416, 442
5.26	442	5.82	322, 323, 374 n.19
5.37	320 n.28, 343 n. 55,	5.83	324
	372 n.15	5.86–8	327 n.50
5.38	320 n.26, 353, 375 n.19	5.86	313
5.39	341 n. 42	5.90–1	313
5.42–50	327 n.54	5.91	325 n.45
5.42	441, 442 n.76	6.13	312
5.43	47, 442 n.76	6.14	326 n.49
5.44	417, 417 n.10,	6.80	312
	442 n.76, 444	6.99–100	325 n.45, 326
5.45	417, 442 n.76	7.180	326 n.49
5.46	441, 442 n.76	7.185	326 n.49
5.47	417, 429, 442 n.76	8.7	384 n.12
5.48	417, 441, 442 n.76,	8.8	312
	447 n.94	8.84	328 n.57
5.49	442 n.76	9.1	326 n.49
5.50	425, 429, 441, 442 n.76	9.4	325 n.45
5.52	344 n. 61	9.27	325 n.45
5.57	375 n.19	9.28	326 n.49
5.58	320 n.28, 372 n.1, 429	9.43	325 n.45

9.55	312	228 F 26	370 n.8
10.15	325 n.45	228 F 26	370
		228 F 32a [32b]	406
DIOGENIANUS- CHOEROBOSCUS		228 F 32b	409
		228 F 33	403
<i>Orthographia</i>	322	228 F 50	394
		228 F 51	396
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS		228 F 52	396
<i>De Demosthene</i>		228 T 1–11	368, 368 n.5
5	397, 398, 399	228 T 1	373 n.18, 376 n.25, 391 n.2
<i>De Dinarcho</i>		228 T 6e	343 n. 58, 345
2–3	336 n. 24	228 T 10	391 n.1
2	320 n.26	328 F 64	370, 370 n.8
3	312, 318	328 F 65	333–4 n. 10
<i>De Thucydide</i>			
7.5.2–3	439, 439 n.66	FAVORINUS	
<i>Epistula ad Pompeium</i>		<i>Memorabilia</i>	328
1–2	398, 399	fr. 7 Mensching	321–2
1.16	398, 399	fr. 11	322
DURIS		GNOMOLOGIUM	
ap. Ath. 12.542b	371 n.1	VATICANUM	
		no. 48 Sternbach	323 n.37
EUSEBIUS-HIERONYMUS		no. 335	318
<i>Chronologica</i>			
115	317, 324–5	HERMIPPUS	
		fr. 38 W.	326
EUSTATHIUS		fr. 39	326
<i>Commentarii</i>		fr. 58	312, 320, 403 n.31
ad <i>Il.</i> 15.680 (1037.57)	393	fr. 92	403 n.30
ad <i>Od.</i> 11.521 (1697.57)	408		
	n.38	HERMOGENES	
<i>FGrH</i>		<i>Progymnasmata</i>	
75 T 2, F4	375 n.19	1 <i>RhGr</i> II, pp. 3–4	
228 F 4	377 n.26	Spengel	439 n.65
228 F 11a	398	HERODOTUS	
228 F 11b	397, 398	1.84,3	435 n.54

1.93,1	435 n.54	INSCRIPTIONES	
1.141	425, 428, 440	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>	
2.134–5	421, 423	II ² 450	338
5.101,2	435 n.54	II ² 452	338 n. 31
		II ² 453	338
HESIODUS		II ² 454	338 n. 31
<i>Opera et dies</i>		II ² 585	340 n. 38
201	419	II ² 670	338 n. 31
202–12	419 n.15 428	II ² 682	335 n. 17
214	395	II ² 788	335
		II ² 834	348 n. 2
HIPPIAS		II ² 1187	340 n.36
86 B4 D-K	417	II ² 1201	337 n. 28, 339, 340, 348, 348 n.4, 349, 370 n.7
HIPPONAX		II ² 1272	335 n. 16
fr. 92, 10ss. West	427 n.39	II ² 1287	335 n. 19
		II ² 1299	335 n. 16
HOMERUS		II ² 1303–7	335 n. 16
<i>Ilias</i>		II ² 1627	338 n. 32
2.404–9	399–402, 402 n.28	II ² 2323a	340 n. 37
2.409	405	II ² 2847	335 n. 17
6.35	395, 395 n.17, 396	II ² 2854	335 n. 18
19.407–17	419	II ² 2856	335 n. 18
20.3	395, 395 n.17	II ² 2971	318, 323 n.35, 334–8
<i>Odyssea</i>		II ² 3055–6	342 n. 48
1.332ff.	404 n.32	II ² 3073	342 n. 48
3.267	406–8	II ² 3460	335 n. 19
11.54	408 n.38	II ² 3835	336 n. 22
16.403	420 n.18	<i>Marmor Parium</i>	
18.17	393	B 13	349
23.296	403–5	B 16	341 n. 44
		B 24	337 n. 30
[HOMERUS]		<i>Museum Epigraphicum</i>	
<i>Margites</i>	409, 427 n.39	no. 13379	336
IBYCUS		<i>Pouilloux, La Forteresse de Rhamnonte</i>	
fr. 342 Page	427 n.39	no. 7	335 n. 18

<i>Reinmuth, Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.</i>		<i>Perikeiromene</i>	361
no. 15	335 n. 17	<i>Sicyonius</i>	360
<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>		MYTHOGRAPHUS	
24 no. 154	335 n. 18	HOMERICUS	394, 394 N.13, 395 n.17
ISOCRATES		NEPOS	
<i>Orationes</i>		<i>Miltiades</i>	
15.9.101	314 n.6	6	318, 333 n. 5
IUVENALIS		<i>Phocion</i>	
<i>Saturae</i>		3	318
10.61–4	319 n.23	NICOLAUS SOPHISTA	
LEXICON CANTABRIGIENSE		<i>Progymnasmata</i>	
337, 350	350	1 <i>RhGr</i> iii, pp. 451–554	
		Spengel	424, 439 n.65
[LUCIANUS]		NONIUS	
<i>Demosthenis encomium</i>		<i>De conpendiosa doctrina</i>	
31	315 n.11	12	318
LYCURGUS		PAPYRI	
<i>Oratio in Leocratem</i>		CPF	
95	426	I 1*	381 n.1
		I 1**	387 n.31
LYSIAS		<i>P. Lille</i>	
<i>Orationes</i>		88 (CPF 1.1**	
3, 7	357	42 1T)	387 n.31, 388
		<i>P. Elephantines</i>	
MARIUS VICTORINUS		“The Words of Ahikar”	
<i>Ars Grammatica</i>		col 9.165–6 (p. 225	
1.4	391 n.1	Cowley)	429, 435
		<i>P. Rylands</i>	
MENANDER		III 493	443, 443 n.78, 444, 444 n.85
<i>Aspis</i>	360		
<i>Dyscolus</i>	341	<i>P. Schubart</i>	
<i>Epitrepontes</i>	361	21	395
<i>Kolax</i>	361		

<i>PSI</i>		PHerc. 1004, col. 101	
2.144	388	(vol. 1.377)	386 n.24
<i>inv. CNR</i>		PHerc. 1015, fr. 6.1–7	
70 (inedito)	387	(vol. 1.272)	383
<i>P. Scholastici</i>		PHerc. 1015, fr. 23.10–15	
175, 185, 195, 208,		(vol. 1.278)	384
254, 359 (Zalateo)	438 n.65	<i>De Rhetorica IV</i>	
		PHerc. 1007, col. 11a.1–4	
PHAEDRUS		(vol. 1.192 Sudhaus)	382 n.4
<i>Fabulae</i>		PHerc. 1007, col. 15a.	
1 prol. 1–2	436	20–18a8 (vol. 1.197)	383
1 prol. 2–4	435 n.59	PHerc. 1007, col. 40a.24–	
1 prol. 4–6	436	42a4 (vol. 1.221–2)	382
4 prol. 11–13	416		
5.1	312	PHOTIUS	
		<i>Bibliotheca</i>	
PHILISTUS		69b34–40	315 n.10
<i>FGrH</i> 556 F 6	426	493a41	388 n.36, 392 n.5
PHILOCHORUS		PLATO	
<i>FGrH</i> 328 F65	333–4 n. 10	<i>Alcibiades I</i>	
		123A	427 n.38
PHILODEMUS		<i>Gorgias</i>	
<i>Academicorum historia</i>		483E–484A	421
PHerc. 1021 et 164,		<i>Leges</i>	379
col. 7.19–8.17	385 n.18	775Aff.	379 n.33
<i>De musica</i>		775B	379 n.31
pp. 20, 32.21 Kemke	406 n.35	958Dff.	379 n.33
<i>De Rhetorica</i>	381, 386	959E	379 n.33
PHerc. 224, fr. 12 (vol.		<i>Phaedo</i>	
2.173 Sudhaus)	384, 384 n.15	60B–C	427, 428, 446 n.89
PHerc. 453, fr. 4		61B	424
(67–9 Crönert)	384	<i>Symposium</i>	
PHerc. 1004, col. 48.1–16		174B8ff.	400
(vol. 1.346 Sudhaus)	382		
PHerc. 1004, col. 55		PLINIUS MAIOR	
(vol. 1.350)	385	<i>Naturalis historia</i>	
		34.12.27	318, 333 n. 5

PLINIUS MINOR		21.5	379 n.35
<i>Panegyricus</i>		<i>Sulla</i>	
52	319 n.23	26.1–2	344 n. 63
		<i>Titus Flamininus</i>	
PLUTARCHUS		12.7	386 n28
<i>Moralia</i>			
<i>Adv. Colotem</i>		[PLUTARCHUS]	
1126Aff.	379 n.36	<i>Vitae decem oratorum</i>	
<i>De E apud Delphos</i>		841F	342 n. 47
385D–E	438, 438 n.64	842A	355 n.21
<i>Quomodo adolescens poetas</i>		842B	386 n.26
<i>audire debeat</i>		845	392 n.5
14E9	438 n.65	845A	388 n.36
<i>An seni respublica gerenda sit</i>		846C	315 n.10
790C	427 n.39	848A	426, 446 n.89
<i>Septem sapientium convivium</i>		850C–E	320 n.26
147C	438, 438 n.64		
<i>Reg. et imp. apophthegmata</i>		POLLUX	
189D	343 n. 57	<i>Onomastikon</i>	
<i>Praec. ger. rei publicae</i>		5	353 n.17
820E	318, 333 n. 5,	8.53	339 n. 34, 350
	334 n. 11	8.102	349
820F	319 n.23	9.42	320 n.26
<i>Vitae</i>			
<i>Demetrius</i>		POLYAENUS	
8–10	336 n. 24	<i>Strategemata</i>	
9.3	319 n.22, 320 n.27	3.15	319 n.22
<i>Demosthenes</i>		4.7.6	336 n.25
9.3–4	392 n.5		
9.3	388 n.36	POLYBIUS	
28.2–3	315 n.11	<i>Historiae</i>	
<i>Phocion</i>		5.93.8	368
27	315	12.13.9–12	351 n.11
27.1–6	385 n.18		
35	318	QUINTILIANUS	
<i>Solon</i>		<i>Institutio orat.</i>	
4.7	441	10.1.80	313

SCHOLIA		fr. 13 P-T = 8	420 n.19
<i>In Aristophanis Aves</i>		fr. 14 P-T = 9	420 n.19
471	424 n.31	fr. 16 P-T = 12	420 n.19
651	446 n.91	fr. 17 P-T = 13	420 n.20,
<i>In Aristophanis Vespas</i>			428, 446 n.92
1446	434	fr. 18 P-T = 14	420 n.19
<i>In Callimachi Iambum I</i>		fr. 22 P-T = 18	420 n.19
(PSI 1094)	434		
<i>In Homeri Iliadem</i>		SOLON	
2.408	402 nn. 27, 28, 409	fr. 11 West	421 n.21
5.906	396 n.17		
6.23	396 n.17	SOPHOCLES	
6.35	394	<i>Ajax</i>	
6.414	393	1142-9	427 n.39
13.5	393		
14.221	393	SOTION	
15.194	393 n.11	fr. 18W.	312, 321
15.683-4	393		
16.411	393	STEPHANUS BYZANTINUS	
S 407b	420 n.20	<i>Ethnika</i>	
T 407c	419 n.17, 446 n.91	s.v. Κορώπη	396
<i>In Homeri Odysseam</i>			
1.332	404 n.32	STOBAEUS	
3.267	406-8	<i>Anthologium</i>	
18.17	393	3.1.172	323 n.39, 418, 437,
23.296	404, 405		442
<i>In Nicandrum</i>	396	3.5.43	403
<i>Plautinum</i>			
<i>Proleg. de comoedia</i>		STRABO	
pp. 48.6-49.2 Koster	432	<i>Geographica</i>	
		1.2.3	407, 407 n.36, 408 n.37
SCOLIA		9.1.20	318, 333 nn. 5, 7
892 Page	427 n.39	13.1.54	344 nn. 62, 63,
			432 n.49
SEMONIDES			
fr. 3 P-T = 11 West	420 n.9	STRATON	
fr. 7 P-T = 7	420 nn. 19,	fr. 10 W.	368
	20, 431	fr. 18	441
fr. 12 P-T = 5	420 n.19	fr. 93	428

SUDA		13.3	359 n.32
s.v. Δημήτριος	312, 314,	14	360
	316, 322, 345 n. 67	14.3	359 n.32
s.v. Στράτων	320 n.28	17	360
		17.8	359 n.32
TERTULLIANUS		24.4	359 n.32
<i>Apologeticum</i>		26	360
18	391 n.1	26.5	359 n.32
		27.9	359 n.32
THEOGNIS		29.2	359 n.32, 360 n.34
fr. 602 West	427 n.39	29.4–5	359 n.32
		<i>Fragmenta</i> (FHS&G)	
THEON PHILOSOPHUS		68 nr. 37	417, 429
<i>De utilitate math.</i>		137 nrr. 39, 40, 41	417
72.24–73.1 Hiller	429 n.44	436 nr. 16	441
		514	371
THEON RHETOR		579A	354 n.18
<i>Progymnasmata</i>		583	441
2 <i>RhGr</i> II, p. 66.9–14		589 nr. 17	341 n.45
Spengel	426	589 nr. 17a	417 n.10, 444
3 <i>RhGr</i> II, pp. 72–8	439 n.65	610	318 n.20
3 <i>RhGr</i> II, p. 73.1–13	424 n.28	650	363
3 <i>RhGr</i> II, p. 73.14–21		666 nr. 7	441
	419 n.17, 425 n.34,	666 nr. 17	447 n.95
	440 n.67, 445 n.88	727 nr. 3	417
3 <i>RhGr</i> II, p. 73.31–2	420 n.18	727 nr. 12	441, 447 n.94
		727 nr. 13	425, 429, 430, 441,
THEOPHRASTUS			442, 442 n.76
<i>Characteres</i>	444	729	447, 447 n.94
1.2	359 n.32		
5.3	359 n.32	THEOPOMPUS	
6.8	359 n.32	115 F 127 <i>FGrH</i>	426
7	359		
7.7	359 n.32	TIMOCREON	
8.11	359 n.32	fr. 729 Page	427 n.39
11.6	359 n.32	fr. 730.4	424
12.5	359 n.32	fr. 734	427 n.39
12.13	359 n.32	fr. 734.8	424

TZETZES		VITAE AESOPI	
<i>Prolegomena ad Lycophronem</i>		G e W 127ss. Perry	421
p. 4.5ff. Scheer	409	G e W 134–9	422 n.26
		G e W 141	427
VALERIUS MAXIMUS		XENOPHANES	
<i>Facta et dicta</i>		FVS 21 B 34	373
8.12 ext. 2	382 n.4		